National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Services des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

THIS DISSERTATION
HAS BEEN MICROFILMED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

LA THÈSE A ÉTÉ
MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE
NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

NL 339 (r. 86/01)

Canada

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

93

TC –

0-315-22949-7

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE SERVICE – SERVICE DES THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

PERMISION TO MICROFILM – AUTORISATION DE MICROFILMER

• Please print or type – Écrire en lettres moulées ou dactylographier

AUTHOR – AUTEUR

Full Name of Author – Nom complet de l'auteur

SANDRA JUNE WEBER

Date of Birth – Date de naissance

JUNE 6 1947

Canadian Citizen – Citoyen canadien

☑ Yes / Oui ☐ No / Non

Country of Birth – Lieu de naissance

CANADA

Permanent Address – Résidence fixe

#1502, 10011-116 STREET
EDMONTON, ALBERTA
T5K 1V4

THESIS – THÈSE

Title of Thesis – Titre de la thèse

TEACHER EDUCATORS: A SEARCH FOR MEANING

Degree for which thesis was presented
Grade pour lequel cette thèse fut présentée

Ph. D.

Year this degree conferred
Année d'obtention de ce grade

1985

University – Université

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

Name of Supervisor – Nom du directeur de thèse

DR. MARGARET McNAY

AUTHORIZATION – AUTORISATION

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to **microfilm** this thesis and to **lend** or **sell copies of the film.**

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de **microfilmer** cette thèse et de **prêter** ou de **vendre des exemplaires du film.**

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

ATTACH FORM TO THESIS – VEUILLEZ JOINDRE CE FORMULAIRE À LA THÈSE

Signature

Sandra Weber

Date

OCTOBER 9 1985

NL-91 (r. 84/03)

Canada

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

TEACHER EDUCATORS: A SEARCH FOR MEANING

by

SANDRA J. WEBER

(C)

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

DEPARTMENT OF ELEMENTARY EDUCATION

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: SANDRA JUNE WEBER

TITLE OF THESIS: TEACHER EDUCATORS: A SEARCH FOR MEANING

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED: DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: FALL, 1985

Permission is hereby granted to the UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly, or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

(Signed) Sandra Weber

PERMANENT ADDRESS:

5775 Leger Avenue

Cote St. Luc

Quebec H4W 2E7

DATED October 8, 1985

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled TEACHER EDUCATORS: A SEARCH FOR MEANING submitted by Sandra June Weber in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

Margaret McKay

Supervisor

R. G. McIntosh

Peggy Plath

Reender Wiersma

Thomas E. Barone Jr.

External Examiner

Date July 22, 1985

DEDICATION

In loving memory of my grandmother, REBECCA WEBER, whose thirst for knowledge has always been an inspiration;

To my grandmother, EDYTHE KAUFMANN KERT, whose loving care and encouragement I rely on;

And especially to my mother, JOAN FINFER REIDER, who taught me how to turn "I think I can" into "I thought I could".

ABSTRACT

Although very thorough in examining education students, cooperating teachers, program structures, and the like, the research literature of teacher education is remarkably silent on the topic of teacher educators themselves. What is it like to be a teacher educator? How do teacher educators live their professional lives? What are their aspirations and their intentions? How do teacher educators talk about teacher education? What does teacher education mean to them? This study is a phenomenological inquiry into the nature and meaning of teacher education as it is lived by university-based teacher educators.

A rich accumulation of life experience was gathered through interviewing, journal writing, reading, and reflection. This material is presented in the form of descriptive stories that capture some of the significant moments in a teacher educator's life. Through careful analysis, teacher education emerges as a generative mode of being, as a primary way in which teacher educators search for meaning and confirmation in their own lives. This way of being involves a deep commitment to teaching and learning, a commitment which is shown to rest in the belief in the power of learning to raise us above the mundane aspects of our daily lives and to open more and better possibilities for human

existence. More specifically, the practice of the teacher educator rests in the hope of touching the lives of children by touching the practice of future teachers, thereby making schools better places for children to be. By conserving what is good or potentially good and by imagining what could be and ought to be, teacher educators hope to offer inspiring guides for practice, thereby making "a difference". What "ought to be" is shown to be intimately related to one's own personal experience as teacher and learner. In the lives of teacher educators, teaching is revealed as authentic dialogue, as inspiring, as seeking confirmation as knower by testing ideas, as learning, as modeling, but sometimes, also as exhortation or coercion, and as a turning away from pedagogy. It is suggested that an important aspect of our pedagogical task is to learn how to call our students; calling is shown as meaning being able also to respond.

An examination of the lived-time of a teacher educator's professional life reveals the fluctuating tensions of a dual commitment: a commitment to the learning of one's students, and a commitment to furthering professional understanding (i.e. the teacher educator's own learning and professional culture). In the final chapter, several images or metaphors are offered that point to some possibilities of existence within teacher education.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Without the generosity and the enthusiastic cooperation of the six participants whose stories form the core of this study, my entire project would not have been possible. It is only my desire to safeguard their identity that prevents me from singing their names and praises from the rooftops. I thank them for all they have taught me and given me.

Much love and gratitude go to my daughter Stephanie and to my dearest friend and husband, Michel. Their patience, love, and encouragement were essential to this project.

I am deeply grateful to my advisor, Dr. Margaret McNay, for her knowledgeable advice and support, and for her impressive critical and editorial skills. One could not ask for a better advisor or friend.

I also feel a special debt of gratitude to Dr. Max van Manen and Dr. Ton Beekman. Their teachings, writings, and advice have been a major source of inspiration and new learning. It has truly been a privilege to study with them.

I wish to especially thank all the members of my original supervisory committee: Dr. Marian Jenkinson, Dr. Gordon McIntosh, and Dr. Leendert Mos. Their perceptive comments and support were very helpful and are deeply appreciated.

Special acknowledgement must also be made of the expert help and the warm encouragement I have received during the course of my studies from Dr. Myer Horowitz, Dr. Gamilla Morcos, Dr. Robert Paterson, and Dr. W.H.O. Schmidt. I thank them sincerely.

A grateful "Merci" goes to my friends and colleagues at the Faculté Saint-Jean who tolerated with patience and some amusement my efforts to incorporate aspects of my daily life into this study. Their support and understanding is greatly appreciated. A special thank you goes to France Levasseur-Ouimet, Claudette Tardif, and Laurent Godbout for their considerable help.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONCERNING THE TITLE 1

CHAPTER ONE ASKING THE QUESTIONS 3

I. The Questions 3

II. Turning to the Research Literature. 11

CHAPTER TWO PREPARING THE RESEARCH. 18

I. Choosing the Methodology. 18

II. Concerning Phenomenology. 20

III. Hermeneutic Phenomenology 23

IV. Methodological Considerations 26

CHAPTER THREE DOING THE RESEARCH. 35

I. Gathering the Life Experience Material. . . . 36

A. My Own Experience 36

B. Teacher Educators 38

II. Interviewing: Some Critical Reflections. . . . 45

A. Disclosure and the Balance of Power 45

B. Preconceptions of Interviewing. 48

C. Interviewing as Dialogue. 49

D. After the Interview 57

III. Recording and Organizing the Material. 63
A. Recording, Transcribing, Referencing . . . 63
B. Reviewing the Material. 65
C. Quoting the Participants. 69
IV. Describing and Interpreting. 70
A. Concerning Description and Interpretation . 70
B. Evocative Description 72
C. Interpretation: the Search for Themes . . . 74
D. Writing and Rewriting 75

CHAPTER FOUR STORIES FROM OUR LIVES 81
I. A Story by Ilana 83
A. The Joy of Knowing. 84
B. Of Confirmation, Learning, and Teaching . . 86
C. Pointing the Way. 89

II. Stories Told by Rachel 92
1. Brown Bear, Brown Bear 92
A. The Joy Revisited 94
B. The Need for Evocative Illustration 95
C. Theory and Practice 97
2. Like Wallpaper Paste 100
A. Teacher Education as Struggle 102
B. A Double Commitment 103
C. Images. 105

III. Stories Told by Michael. 108
A. Challenge, Pain, and Risk 110
B. Commitment to Teaching. 112
C. Learning about Teaching 114

IV. Stories Told by Josee. 116
A. Confirmation and Disillusionment. 117

V. Stories Told by Serena 123
1. An Alternative to Collecting Milk Money. . . 123
A. The Need to Grow. 124
B. The Hermeneutic Circle. 126
2. It Can Happen. 128
A. The Pedagogical Relationship. 131

VI. A Story by Sandra. 134

CHAPTER FIVE BEING A TEACHER EDUCATOR 139
I. Pointing the Way: Cultural Generativity. . . 140
II. Touching the Lives of Children 144
III. Making a Difference 146

CHAPTER SIX OUR LIVES AS PROFESSORS 158

I. Teacher Educator as Professor. 158

A. The Offer: the Initial Challenge 158

B. Formal Research: A Waste of Time?. 163

C. The Education Professoriate. 170

II. The Time of our Lives 173

A. Time and the Quantification of Work. . . . 174

B. Whose Time? Whose Work?. 176

C. Chosen Time, Controlled Time 179

D. Controlling Time 181

E. Time as Enemy and Tyrant 184

F. Time as Isolating. 186

G. Lived Time 188

H. Time as Transcendent 191

CHAPTER SEVEN COMPLETING THE CIRCLE 194

I. Images. 194

II. What is it to be a Teacher Educator? 200

III. Back to the Beginning 206

IV. Implications and Further Reflections. 210

REFERENCES 215

CONCERNING THE TITLE

Books, articles, dissertations, and papers are supposed to begin with titles, with something to guide the writing and to orient the reader. Although the title is the first part of a manuscript that meets the reader, it is often among the very last words written. Perhaps this is because authors do not really know what they are going to write until they have actually written it, and so they wait to see what the baby looks like, a postnatal searching for clues to an appropriate naming, for a title that "fits". From another point of view, however, the naming of the manuscript (and perhaps of the baby as well) before it is known is an important part of the act of creating. It gives direction, meaning, impetus, or form to that which is to be. Perhaps that is why choosing a name or a title is often so difficult. We invest so much importance in so few words. Titles are iconic. They are supposed to hint at the essence of what is to follow. They are to invite and perhaps to intrigue, but they must not betray by proferring false promises or arousing false hopes.

"Teacher Educators: A Search for Meaning" not only foreshadows the central theme to emerge in this study, it points to the hermeneutic nature of the pertinent research

methodology. This title also very aptly refers to the researcher and to the motivation that sustains the research. The search for meaning in my own life as a teacher educator has indeed ensured a deep interest and commitment to this study.

CHAPTER ONE ASKING THE QUESTIONS

I. The Questions

> The discourse of inquiry cannot be divorced from the social processes; rather, it reflects the hopes, values, beliefs, and commitments of people struggling with existence. (Popkewitz: 1981, p. 162)

> A phenomenological question must not only be made clear, understood, but also "lived" as it were. A phenomenological researcher cannot just write down his question at the beginning of his study. There it is! Question mark at the end! No,in his phenomenological description he must "pull" his reader into the question in such a way that the reader cannot help but wonder about the nature of the phenomenon in the way that the phenomenologist does. (Van Manen: 1984, p.46)

> Nothing is a problem or discovery in itself; it can be a problem only if it puzzles or worries somebody....if you are anxious to find the answer yourself, by your own means, then you have made the problem really yours, you are serious about it. (Polya: 1954, p. 145)

For many years, I have thought of myself as a teacher. This feeling of being a teacher was most intense during the six years that I taught young children, delighting in their curiosity and their enthusiasm: "Oh boy, we're going to build a city." "Tell us another story." "Can I take this book home?" "When are we going to learn about the planets?" "I want to run the projector!" As a classroom teacher, I never felt the need to define pedagogy. Pedagogy was in the living,

in the experiences I shared with the children. My students sometimes called me "Teacher" and I, too, often referred to myself as "Teacher". I thought I knew what I meant, and so, I thought did others.

For the past nine years, however, my students have not been children. They have been adults, young and old, people who want to become teachers, people who say they want to learn how to teach. Like many other teacher educators, my "job" is to prepare them, or to help them prepare themselves, for teaching in the schools. My hope is to inspire my students to become the best possible teachers they can be so that schools will be good places for children to be. I am clear about these intentions and yet am sometimes uncertain how to realize them.

A disturbing malaise manages at times to penetrate my life as a teacher educator, a vague uneasiness that is sometimes hard to shake. This teaching of teachers puzzles me. The very term "teacher educator" sometimes seems so unnatural, almost paradoxical. When I am with children, I can feel and live what teaching is. When I am with aspiring teachers, I am less sure of everything. As a teacher of children, I had no difficulty accepting that responsiblity which the philosopher Levinas says is given to the adult by

and for the child. As teacher educators, however, I feel that we do not and cannot assume the same kind of responsibility for our education students. Yet many of them would like us to do so. "How do you teach math?" "How do you establish classroom control?" "How do you write objectives?" Such questions suggest a deep preoccupation with technique, with the how rather than the what or the why of things, almost as if they were looking for a shield behind which to hide. Who is it that tells education students this is what they need to know? In childless university classrooms set up in rows, we are expected to explain, analyze, and demonstrate the "how" of teaching.

How can we best help our students? What kinds of experiences, information, or inspiration do they need that will make a difference to the kinds of teachers they will be? Should we even aspire to "making a difference"? What kind of difference? Do we not at times promise more than we can deliver? Perhaps we are too often trying to impose our own hopes and ideals on our students, all the while thinking we are helping them find their own philosophy: a self-deception of sorts on our part? Can one really teach people how to teach? Can we truly say that we know what teaching is and that we know how to teach our students about it, or should we rather reflect Buber's conception of education as dialogue

and attempt to discover the meaning of becoming a teacher with our students, or should we do both? Could we do both? Is teaching a learned social behavior that can best be acquired in the field? Is teaching a set of skills or a body of knowledge that can be learned at a faculty of education in two to four years, or is it something more-- perhaps, as David Denton (1974) suggests, a whole way of being? What are we doing at the universities? What should we be doing? What really does it mean to be a teacher educator? The questions persist, each one leading inexorably to another.

These questions are grounded in the lived experience of our lives as teacher educators. They are the fundamental questions that spring forth naturally from the specific queries and problems that teacher educators encounter daily. Some of the questions are not new. Questions about the nature of teaching, for example, have been asked in some form or another for centuries, and have been most eloquently and profoundly addressed by great thinkers from Socrates to Dewey. Concerns and fears similar to those expressed here have been voiced in decades past by teacher educators (see, for example, Carr:1962), but they are concerns that the current state of educational research has not been able to alleviate (Popkewitz, 1984; Wilson, 1981). The questions continue to recur and in their very recurrence tell us of the

mystery and depth of teaching. By their very persistence and by the personal yet universal way they are woven into the fabric of our existence, these questions require a continuous answering:

> Questions seldom die; it is only answers that begin in time to become senile, when the originating questions for which they are answers are forgotten.
> (Gadamer in Smith: 1980, p. 86)

> To truly question something is to interrogate something from the heart of our existence, from the centre of our being.
> (van Manen: 1984, p.45)

The general question echoing throughout the many questions I have been asking seems to be: what is teacher education? The question begins with my own experience as a teacher educator but it continues as a search for a deeper knowledge of teacher education, as a desire to better understand the nature and the possibilities of teacher education. To ask the question as a teacher educator is thus also to ask it as a researcher.

What is teacher education? The question may seem naive, even absurd, unless it is carefully worked out as a philosophical, moral, or scientific inquiry. The question can be interpreted and phrased in many ways:

A. "What is teacher education?" As such, the question is

almost rhetorical. It is a philosophical query, the answer to which might lie within the very meanings of "teacher" and "education". A philosophic reflection on these two words would be one way of trying to answer the question.

B. If "what is teacher education?" really means "what is teacher education <u>like</u> ?", a different answering is required. An appeal is made to the lived experience of teacher education, to the lives of those who live it, to what they do and think, to consideration of the "emic" point of view (a term coined by anthropologist Kenneth Pike to refer to the insider's view), and to metaphoric description.

C. If the question is interpreted as "what is the meaning of teacher education?", it becomes more ambiguous. Meaning for whom? In what context? In the personal context of my life as teacher educator? In the context of a particular society? In the wider context of human existence? In the context of the phenomenon itself? The question might also reflect a search for a sense of purpose or a sense of vocation.

D. Another interpretation of the question might be "what

should teacher education be ? As such, the question could be an invitation to articulate ideals, intentions, and aspirations, or it could be a call for commitment. It could be a search for insight, for the possibilities of existence seen within the phenomenon of teacher education. It could involve praxis, political and historical perspectives, or moral judgement.

E. Somewhat differently, the question could be asked, "what is teacher education for ?" This could be a political question, an administrative question, an economic question, a sociological question, or simply an echo of question C above.

Although these various interpretations overlap, they provide a general context that is helpful in formulating and understanding the specific questions that will guide this study. An analysis of the preliminary reflections that began this chapter suggests that the following research questions might provide a meaningful focus:

1. What is it to be a teacher educator?

This is an inquiry into the meaning of teacher

education as it is lived by teacher educators. I am asking how teacher educators live their professional lives, what their experience is like. In reflecting on how teacher educators talk about teacher education and how they live and describe their experience, we can explore their aspirations and intentions, and we can better understand the possibilities and meaning of their lived experience.

2. What images of teacher education emerge from the lifeworld of teacher educators?

Images can point simultaneously to our past, present and future. In considering the images emerging from the lifeworld of teacher educators, we might gain insight into what being a teacher educator is--and ought-- to be.

These questions are relevant to our current state of knowledge. They are basic and they stem from the lived experience of a teacher educator. They acknowledge teacher education as both a social and a personal phenomenon. Exploratory and descriptive, they bring needed attention to the university context, to the teacher educator's point of view, and to the quality and meaning of life embedded in teacher education.

Teacher education can be viewed, in part, as a complex weaving of the lives of education students, teachers, administrators, professors, and children. Focussing on teacher educators may provide glimpses of the larger whole. Just as listening to parents talk about parenting almost inevitably evokes images of children, images of grandparents, images of social customs and beliefs, and images of parenting itself, listening carefully to teacher educators may reveal much about teacher education. The whole is reflected in the part. Reflecting on one aspect of teacher education can thus lead to a deeper understanding of many aspects.

II. Turning to the Research Literature

Very little research of any kind deals specifically with teacher educators. Although a great many studies have concentrated on the practicum, on student teachers, on first year teachers, on program structure, on recruitment, and on the skills and attitudes of students and cooperating teachers, less than two percent of all entries for teacher education in the Educational Research Information Centre data base relate even remotely to teacher educators. Those few that do are usually survey-type questionnaires on a delimited topic (see, for example, Willson & Horn:1979, or Leslie:1970), or are tributes to pioneers in teacher

education (see, for example, Frederick:1973, or Johanninameier & Merritt: 1978). In the National Society for the Study of Education (NSSE) yearbook on teacher education (Ryan:1975), not one paper deals directly with teacher educators. A systematic and thorough search through the indexes of thirty years of The Journal of Teacher Education, one of the oldest and most respected journals in the field, revealed many interesting articles on other topics but very few specific studies of teacher educators. Yet, as Tabachnick and Zeichner (1981) suggest:

> If we at the universities would hope to prepare progressive teachers as our rhetoric suggests, then we must first become more reflective about our own endeavours at the University. (p.10)

They rightly point out that, as a group, teacher educators seem to be singularly uninterested in self-examination!

Although Shulman (1978),Goldhammer (1981),and Joyce and Clift (1984) maintain that a review of the literature reveals a firm knowledge base for teacher education, Peck and Turner (1973), Taylor (1978), Popkewitz (1984), and Wilson (1981) more convincingly argue that our knowledge and theoretical base is, on the contrary, very limited indeed. Teacher education is most often equated in the literature with programs and structures, with such things as so many hours of coursework or so many weeks of extended

practicum in the schools, and so forth; yet as Horowitz (1974) so aptly illustrated with his soufflé de fromage analogy:

> We can increase the amount and improve the quality of the cheese and the eggs (and the arts and science, foundations, curriculum and instruction and the field experience components) but if we haven't given a great deal of thought to putting the pieces together in a harmonious mix, then the intended gourmet soufflé de fromage may emerge as a flat and uninspired cheese omelet.(p.86)

And where in all this are the teacher educators? I agree with Arnstine (1977) that in order to improve teacher education, teacher educators must clarify their own values and goals through continuing dialogue in the research literature. Lutz (1978) has suggested that the most critical role of educational research is to determine whether or not the best questions are being asked about the phenomenon under study, yet few of the studies or reports that attempt to outline research needs in teacher education (see, for example, Hersom, Birch, Gaskell, Horowitz,& Plante :1981) identify the need to critically examine the teacher educator, to explore the lived experience of the very people who set the research agendas, or to study the teacher educators who spend so much time and effort examining the other participants in teacher education.

The absence of specific research in this area does

not mean that teacher educators are unreflective or that they never examine the meaning of teacher education or their own actions. In fact, some such reflection probably occurs every time a teacher educator writes a syllabus for a course, every time a departmental meeting focusses on what we are doing or what we are trying to achieve, every time a committee formulates a position paper or a list of recommendations. The politics and traditions of teacher education seem to dictate, however, that our self-reflective discourse be confined to oral discussion or to internal administrative documents rather than to the more public realm of the research literature. Nevertheless, there are a few exceptions.

Popkewitz, Tabachnik, and Zeichner (1979), for example, recognize the importance of including teacher educators as a topic worthy of research and have suggested four criteria to guide studies in teacher education:

1. attending to the quality of life embedded in teacher education;
2. linking teacher education to the assumptions and implications of ongoing patterns of schooling;
3. paying equally close attention to the university context as to the schools;
4. engaging in theoretical, historical, and philosophical analysis of the customs, traditions, and categories of professional life.

In articulating these criteria, Popkewitz et al. add breadth and depth to research in teacher education and encourage researchers to ask questions in a manner more appropriate to the very nature of education. Further to this end, the first of their criteria might be expanded to read "attention to the quality and meaning of life embedded in teacher education".

Further, at the University of Maryland, Francine Hultgren (1982) and Jessie Roderick (1984) have each partially described and critically examined their experiences as teacher educators. Through the use of journal writing undertaken as a cooperative venture with their students, they have explored some of the taken-for-granted aspects of teacher education, especially the dialogue between professor and student, and the personhood of each. In their view, teaching is a mode of being and of becoming.

Writing as a participant-observer, Splaine (1981) provides an interesting account of his experience as teacher educator in leading a course called "the study of teaching", an exploratory seminar shared by five education professors and five graduate students. Although the course was supposed to focus on the contention that teaching can be investigated and described as being the act of creating, communicating,

decision making, valuing, and as an aesthetic experience, it is the lived experience of the ensuing pedagogical discussion and the perceptions of each of the participants that emerge as the most compelling aspect of Splaine's account.

A further example of a teacher educator's experience that has been shared in the research literature is provided by George (1974), who wrote a brief first-person account of his search for perspective in teacher education. Worried that the so-called ivory tower of university life had caused him to lose his perspective on teacher education, George began a search for renewed understanding, a search that led him to spend a week as part of a teaching team in a school. He very briefly describes the impact this experience had on him.

In an interesting descriptive study of change involving teacher educators here at the University of Alberta, Ron Richmond (1983) provides evocative examples of how a group of teacher educators viewed teaching within a new program structure. The most revealing parts of his thesis are those passages where the author stands aside and lets the informants do the talking. Richmond perceptively identifies commitment, personal views, and advocacy as important aspects of change, although he does not clarify these aspects or

explore them in any depth. The significance of his dissertation lies in the voice it gives to teacher educators concerning their lived experience.

The rather limited impact of the research literature on the actual teaching practices of teacher educators has recently been asserted by Robby Champion (1984). In suggesting six instructional scenarios to help understand this phenomenon, Champion briefly echoes Richmond by alluding to the importance of personal beliefs in determining what and how we teach. He does not, however, attempt to describe the lived experience of the phenomenon he is exploring, nor does he show the meaning of the phenomenon to our professional lives.

Taken together, these studies reveal a slowly growing awareness of the contribution that might be made to teacher education by in depth qualitative research concerning the experience of teacher educators. The research to be undertaken in the present study is one attempt to meet that need.

CHAPTER TWO PREPARING THE RESEARCH

A. Choosing the Methodology

> There is a dialectical relationship between the researcher, the subject of his interest, and the historical tradition in which he works. (Polanyi: 1962)

In choosing the methodology and research techniques that might best help answer a research question, it is useful to ask what kind of answer the question requires. Once the kind of answer is clear, then the methodology needed to find such an answer may be apparent. Sometimes, of course, an affinity or fidelity to one kind of methodology dictates the questions in the first place: behavioral scientists tend to ask one kind of question, phenomenologists, another. Struggling with a question is one way in which the researcher seeks ways of answering it; methodology thus emerges from reflection on the questions themselves and from a thoughtful search for possible modes of exploration. The data that are gathered and the way they are gathered may in turn point to the best methods of reflection and interpretation. In other words, the research process is dialectical, and an internal coherence develops between questions, methods, and interpretation (Kaplan, 1964).

The research questions that will guide this study are:

What is it to be a teacher educator?

What images of teacher education emerge from the lifeworld of teacher educators?

The first question clearly calls for evocative description of observed and lived experience. It requires access to the point of view of teacher educators and to their experience. The second question calls for further reflection and interpretation, or for what some might call theorizing (Van Manen: 1980). It requires the sort of interpretation that stays close to the description that answers the first question. The question needs what might be called a grounded theorizing rather than a fitting of the data to existing theories. In a more general sense, then, the methodology called for by the research questions is what is popularly called qualitative or naturalistic. Since the expression of the questions has a phenomenological flavour, this study draws heavily on hermeneutic phenomenology for its methodology.

II. Concerning Phemonenology

> Phenomenology aims to come to a deeper understanding of the nature or meaning of our everyday experiences. It asks "What is this or that kind of experience like?"...it attempts to gain insightful descriptions of the way we experience the world... Phenomenology always addresses any phenomenon as a possible human experience; this is why phenomenological descriptions have a universal (intersubjective) character. Phenomenological research is a search for what it means to be human....In phenomenological research the "is" always implies a possible "ought"....phenomenological research has as its ultimate aim to fulfill our human nature: to become more fully who we are. So phenomenology does not offer us the possibility of effective theory with which we can now explain and/or control the world but rather it offers us the possibility of plausible insight which brings us in more direct contact with the world.
> (Max van Manen:1984, p.37)

Herbert Spiegelberg (1969) suggests with some humour that there are almost as many views of phenomenology as there are phenomenologists; phenomenology does not represent a single point of view. Spiegelberg also claims, however, that there is enough common ground among the different schools to speak with some confidence of a phenomenological movement in European twentieth century philosophy. Maurice Roche (1973) concurs, and describes the essential element of phenomenology as a faithfulness to the injunction: "be true to the phenomenon". Although there are marked contrasts between the transcendental phenomenology of Edmund Husserl, the existential school epitomised by Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice

Merleau-Ponty, and the hermeneutic phenomenology of Martin Heidegger and Hans-Georg Gadamer, all of them purport to be ways of inquiry into the essential nature of human experience. All of them emphasize the meaning of lived experience, striving to study "the world as we immediately experience it rather than as we conceptualize, categorize, or theorize about it" (van Manen:1984, p.37). Phenomenology strives to uncover the essence of our lived experiences (that which makes lived experience what it is) and explores our understanding of these phenomena; that is, explores the constitution of these phenomena in our consciousness. More simply put, phenomenologists hold that descriptions of experience as-it-is-lived reveal much about consciousness, about the ways we experience the world. (Roche:1973, p.1). The core of phenomenological inquiry includes a disciplined observation, listening, or recalling that is as "open" and free as possible of theoretical preconceptions. It also requires careful and evocative written descriptions that are as true to the phenomenon as possible, and it requires systematic analysis or reflection on those descriptions. Sound introductions to phenomenology and detailed accounts of the historical roots of phenomenology and its fascinating evolution into at least three different "schools" are provided by Spiegelberg (1965); Giorgi (1970); Roche (1973); Misiak & Sexton (1975); and Barritt, Beekman, Bleeker,&

Mulderij (1983).

In North America, educational researchers have only recently become interested in applied phenomenology. A great deal of phenomenological writing is not yet available in English. Phenomenology has sometimes been perceived as a rather obscure and pretentious philosophy whose jargon mystifies rather than clarifies. Yet the clearly stated aim of phenomenology is to reveal, not to hide. The creation of long hyphenated words, the frequent use of German and French, the capitalization of words such as Being, and the rather poetic and sometimes convoluted language favoured by many phenomenologists, partly reflect the cultural and language differences that may have made phenomenology seem foreign and difficult to some North American researchers, initially discouraging them from exploring its potential. Perhaps the initial lack of widespread interest in phenomenology had more to do with a bias against qualitative research, more to do with the pervasiveness of the behavioral, technical, and managerial approaches that dominate the social sciences.

Gradually, however, interest in phenomenology as a method of inquiry is growing. North American writers such as Giorgi, Denton, and Barritt are responsive to the cultural and language differences. Their writing, in a sense, bridges

the continents, making phenomenology more accessible, and enabling North American researchers to participate in a dialogue. As a further example, the Dutch-born researcher van Manen has gradually dropped hyphens and capitals, reduced the use of German, and provided clearer and more practical descriptions of basic concepts [compare, for example, van Manen (1977) and (1984)]. Although phenomenology was originally the almost exclusive province of philosophers and theorists, lively debates (Strasser: 1963) have erupted as researchers in the fields of anthropology, psychiatry, psychology, and more recently, education, have turned to phenomenology for research methodology. The ongoing discourse between the philosophers (who inquire into phenomenology itself) and the human science researchers (who use phenomenology as a practical means of investigating human phenomena) is likely to further stimulate phenomenology's growth as a method of inquiry in the human sciences.

III. Hermeneutic Phenomenology

"We are all hermeneuts. We find significance and meaning in the world everywhere". (Barritt et al.:1983, p.56)

The methodology of the study proposed here draws deeply from the Utrecht school of hermeneutic phenomenology,

and more specifically from the writings and teachings of Ton Beekman (Utrecht) and Max van Manen (University of Alberta). Their work will be introduced in the next section of this chapter.

Through the work of such scholars as Dilthey, Heideggar, Gadamer, and Ricoeur, phenomenology incorporated into its method certain aspects of the hermeneutic tradition of text interpretation. Briefly stated, hermeneutic phenomenology emphasizes the circular and dialectical nature of any interpretation of lived experience, and the importance of context and of language in our search for understanding. It is founded on the belief that

> relations which, followed in their outward reach, compose my universality and my belonging, compose on their inward reach, my uniqueness and my being. (Mooney: 1975,p.191)

Our human history and our linguistic nature is shared. Understanding one person's experience opens the possibility of understanding human existence; similarly, grasping simultaneously the meaning of human existence informs any understanding of a person's unique experience. Hermeneutic phenomenology demands not a detailed recounting of the so-called facts, but rather an evocative description that shows the reader what the experience is really like, that captures the spirit, meaning, and flavour of the

experience, and that, in a sense, enables the reader to participate in the phenomenon. Through careful analysis or interpretation, the themes or deep structures (what some call "essences") of the experience are revealed as fully as possible without disturbing the wholeness of the phenomenon. The hermeneutic experience of interpreting is circular: through encountering or experiencing the phenomenon in an open manner, we enter into a dialectical interaction between the whole and the part, each giving the other meaning. The whole and the part can only be understood together: this is what is meant by an intuitive leap into the hermeneutic circle. The phenomenon is not dissected into elements but is rather grasped comprehensively. We come to know the phenomenon in a different way than before-- a way that is more <u>of</u> the phenomenon.

A more detailed and evocative description of hermeneutic phenomenological research will emerge in the account of my research experience. For further background and for the philosophical and theoretical roots of hermeneutic phenomenology, I refer the reader to Heidegger (1967, 1977), Gadamer (1979), Dilthey (1976), and Ricoeur (1973). Excellent accounts of the hermeneutic tradition of text interpretation and of its eventual contribution to phenomenology are provided by Palmer (1969) and by Smith

(1983).

IV. Methodological Considerations

In discussing the research process, an important distinction should be made between the description of what is actually being done (i.e., the research experience) and the rationale or idealized version of scientific practice. Kaplan (1964,p.9) warns of the danger in confusing logic-in-use (the cognitive style of the researcher, the lived research process) with reconstructed-logic (an explicit formulation or idealization of the logic-in-use).

Reconstructed-logic (e.g. the empirical method) is derived originally from logic-in-use, and the two influence each other in a dialectical fashion. Although Kaplan (1964) cautions that "the crucial question concerns not the intrinsic virtues of the reconstructed-logic taken in itself, but rather its usefulness in illuminating the logic-in-use"(p.9), many researchers mistake what is meant to be a reconstructed-logic for a literal description of what the research process is, applying it like a recipe. They may thus be reluctant to see, or if they see, to admit that their research experience does not correspond to what they mistook for logic-in-use. Research reports usually jump from formal

methodological statements to an account of the findings. This is unfortunate, because it is difficult to improve our methodological conceptualisations without access to more detailed accounts of the lived experience of research.

Anthropologist Morris Freilich's distinction between the "smart" and the "proper" is another way of exploring Kaplan's warning. Freilich (1977) says that in any culture:

> there is <u>the "proper" way</u> to do most things (the official way, the idealized norm, the culturally "right", the verbalized); and,
>
> there is <u>the "smart" way</u> (the unspoken operational rules, the actual way people usually do things, the socially "right").

Research reports are usually long-winded concerning the "proper", but very secretive about the "smart". As Miles and Huberman (1984, p.22) point out,

> there appears to be little sharing of experience, even at the rudimentary level of recipe exchanges. We don't know much about what other qualitative researchers are actually doing when they reduce, analyze, and interpret data.

Miles and Huberman go on to suggest that a sort of double bind is operating here: the status of conclusions from qualitative studies is uncertain because researchers don't report on their methods, and researchers don't report on their methods because there are no established conventions for doing so.

In the human sciences, we are seeking to improve our research methodologies. Ideally, our conception of the "proper" should be derived from a deep understanding of the "smart", and vice versa. We cannot improve one without knowledge of the other. As qualitative methodology gains respectability in educational research, more detailed formulations of methodology and of the research experience itself are slowly becoming available.

Until very recently, phenomenology's contribution to educational research has been as a philosophy, as a source of inspiration for inquiry, and as an exciting but vaguely articulated orientation towards research. Indeed, phenomenology has been called a method without techniques. (van Manen:1984) Within the last two years, however, leading researchers have begun to address the need for more explicit formulations of their methodology. Ton Beekman of Utrecht, for example, has visited North America frequently, giving challenging conferences and seminars and offering researchers insightful advice. As one researcher remarked, "Ton not only talks about phenomenology, he lives it". Beekman, in collaboration with Hans Bleeker, Karel Mulderij, and with Loren Barritt (1983) of the University of Michigan has written <u>A handbook for phenomenological research in</u>

education in which three phases of the research process are identified and partially explored:

1. gathering the life experience: usually through some combination of interviewing, observing, writing, and reflection;

2. examining the material for its descriptive-analytic forms (themes or structures) and testing these forms through variation, consultation, and reflection;

3. formulating recommendations and orientations for practical action.

Barritt et al. do not provide a detailed exploration or theoretical formulation of all of these phases. The strength of this handbook lies not in its reconstructed logic, but in its rich and evocative description of the analysis phase of research. Using the phenomenological investigation of the fear of darkness as an example, Barritt et al. show how they wrote and re-wrote descriptions, and how they sought the meaning of their descriptions through the exploration of themes; in short, they show us, at least partially, what the research experience was like. They provide the beginnings of a logic-in-use that will enable researchers to better understand and evaluate phenomenology as methodology.

In another most helpful article, Barritt et al. (1984) offer these suggestions to educational researchers:

Suggestion I : Write an account of a single experience, something simple and straightforward; as much as possible stick to descriptive language and watch out for interpretations and attributions of causality in your writing. Don't lose yourself in factual details. It all begins with the lived experience and that is what you should strive to describe.

Suggeston II : Read through each description and select from it those moments which seem to be at the center of the event for the person. Those moments which "fly up like sparks" from the description. Don't worry about taking too much. Try to read each description with "fresh eyes", anew, letting it speak for itself of the event.

Often themes are not found in the words of the description but between the lines. In these cases it is important that the choice of words be "correct"... It is a good idea to ask informants to read through the analysis before it is in final form. An informant does not have the right of veto over your insights, but his comments may lead to a more accurate formulation or to the insertion of a paragraph explaining that your insights were not seconded.

Suggestion III : Compare the themes you have chosen with one another. Make a list of shared themes. Try to be careful to formulate the common forms or themes in a way that is faithful to descriptions. Make a separate list for unique variations on the themes. Variations frequently highlight the meaning of the common forms.

Suggestion IV : Try putting the experience in a different context, a different situation. In other words, consider a phenomenological variation. Often, that gives a sharper picture of the shared aspects of the lived experience.

Suggestion V : Fill out the descriptions with new materials from poems, novels, diaries, folk tales, pictures, tape recordings, observations, interviews, etc. Be careful with this material. The question is not, how pretty is it, rather does it give an adequate descriptive picture of the lived experience?

> Suggestion VI : Phenomenological research is done with an eye to the consequences for action. Based on the research results, try to formulate recommendations that might lead to more possibilities for human autonomy, a better situation for those on whom a decision is to be visited. Knowledge of history can help to suggest directions for action.

These suggestions evoke the kinds of activities involved in hermeneutic phenomenological research. The suggestions are both practical and sound. However, the authors seem to start their advice in the middle of the research process, providing few details concerning the important tasks of asking the question and gathering the life experience. Barritt et al. rightly bring out the importance and the responsibility of studying the implications of research findings, although the phrase "a better situation for those on whom a decision is to be visited" seems a little disturbing. Does it suggest a perhaps too eager willingness to dictate specific policy or action, to make others' decisions for them? Perhaps, they are simply referring to the many decisions and policies we "visit" unthinkingly on children.

In an excellent monograph entitled, "Doing phenomenological research", Max Van Manen (1984) who studied in Holland with Beekman and with Langeveld, has recently provided a thorough and thoughtful analysis of the research experience. Using research concerning parenting as an

illustration, he not only reveals the methodological structure of phenomenological research, he also shows us what the lived experience of such research can be like. Like Barritt and Beekman, his theoretical formulation of the research process is thus grounded in his own experience as a researcher.

Van Manen sees research as a dynamic interplay among four procedural activities:

a. turning to a phenomenon which seriously interests us and commits us to the world; in other words, asking the question;

This phase involves orienting to the phenomenon phenomenologically, that is, asking about the nature of a lived experience and explicating assumptions and pre-understandings.

b. investigating experience as we live it rather than as we conceptualize it;

This can involve describing one's own experience, obtaining experiential descriptions from others, tracing etymological sources, searching idiomatic phrases, locating experiential descriptions in literature and other art forms, and consulting other phenomenological writing.

c. reflecting on the essential themes which characterize the phenomenon;

This phase of phenomenological analysis or interpretation includes uncovering through an open and sensitive "listening" the thematic aspects in life-world descriptions. It involves systematically identifying thematic statements, composing linguistic transformations, gleaning thematic description from artistic sources, and through careful reflection and a dialectical interrogation of the experience, determining the essential themes.

d. describing the phenomenon through the art of writing and re-writing.

"Attending to the speaking of language" and varying the examples, the researcher writes and rewrites responsively and reflectively, until a way is found that illuminates and reveals as much as possible the essential nature of our experience of the phenomenon. Possible modes for this writing are thematic, analytic, exemplicative, existential, and exegetic.

Van Manen illustrates and explores the activities of each research "phase", while at the same time stressing their interrelatedness and their tentative nature. He cautions

that "the methodology of phenomenology is more a carefully cultivated thoughtfulness than a technique." (p.27)

Turning now to my own research, we can see that the first chapter of this dissertation has served the function of orienting to the phenomenon and asking the research question. The next chapter describes the activities involved in existential investigation (or what Beekman calls gathering the life material), and further discloses the activities and experience of phenomenological reflection.

CHAPTER THREE DOING THE RESEARCH

Denton (1979) has advocated a search for methodology suited to the nature of education itself, suggesting it is perhaps time to create our own methodologies instead of relying so heavily on the natural and the social sciences. If this search is to be fruitful, Miles and Huberman (1984) suggest that researchers must provide detailed descriptions of research and thorough methodological reflections. Kaplan's calls for more complete descriptions of logic-in-use and for a dialectical reflectionship between logic-in-use and reconstructed logic are most relevant here. Responding to these calls for more thorough reporting, I will present a descriptive account of my research that includes reflections on the experience while also offering more general methodological considerations.

I. Gathering the Life Experience Material: Existential Investigation

> In the literature, the aspect of existential investigation in doing phenomenological research has been called "generating data"....From a phenomenological point of view it would be more appropriate to see this part of the research process as the educational development of the researcher: that is, finding ways to develop deeper understandings of the phenomenon being investigated. (van Manen: 1984, p.50)

A. My Own Experience

The first and most obvious source of "data" for this study is my own experience as a teacher educator. I am a teacher educator looking at teacher educators and at teacher education; to pretend that I am an impartial outsider would be dishonest and foolish. For the past three years, as this study progressed, I have kept an occasional journal, recording some of my daily experience, hopes, worries, thoughts, and opinions. This material provides a starting point for reflection on the lifeworld of teacher educators; as well, it serves the important function of making me more aware of my own orientation and values.

Although reflective description of one's own conscious experience is central to phenomenology, and, indeed, is the source of the research questions this study

will address, my own experience is not enough. Paradoxical as it may seem, we can learn as much (or more) about ourselves by considering the experience of others as we can by writing about our own experience. One teacher educator, for example, said, "I'm really kind of excited about it, you know, the possibility of helping so many children, of changing things in the schools". This immediately brought back some strong feelings I once had about wanting to be a teacher educator. The experience of a colleague helped me relive some forgotten moments that I probably would not have recaptured otherwise.

Carefully listening and thinking about the experience of others also helps us stand away from our own experience, to see it in a different light. After listening to a tape of another interview, for example, I noticed how, in answer to my questions, my colleague answered rapidly in what I for the first time recognized as jargon. As the tape continued, I suddenly saw, again as if for the first time, that I too was speaking this way. Reflecting on the experience of others helps us better analyze our own; reflecting on our own experience helps us better understand theirs. Whether by contrast, similarity, interaction, or self-disclosure, the meeting of two experiences reveals more clearly the meaning of each. This leads to the central way of gathering data for

this study: interviewing other teacher educators, colleagues whom I will refer to hereafter as "the participants".

B. Teacher Educators : interviews, written material, and observations

The core of this study is the description of experience offered in interviews by six teacher educators who gave generously of their time, meeting with me on numerous occasions, and in some instances, inviting me into their classrooms and their homes. All of the participants hold or have held university positions involved with the education components of a university-based undergraduate teacher preparation program. For the purposes of this study, "teacher educator" thus excludes cooperating teachers as well as university professors who do not teach undergraduate education courses.

I interviewed teacher educators from two different universities, with varied backgrounds and different department affiliations. My intention was to encounter a wide range of viewpoints and experience, to ensure a dialogue of experiences, and the making of contrasts or comparisons that would help to separate the unique from the shared. The participants were chosen as people who could help me think about teacher education, people with whom to build a dialogue

that might reveal aspects of teacher education that neither I nor they had seen before. Our purpose was to bring to awareness new perspectives which could be of use to all teacher educators. Potential participants were often referred to me by people who had read my research proposal and said, "Why don't you ask _____ , he's got a lot to say?" or "She's had lots of experience, maybe she'd be interested". One of the participants is some one I already knew slightly whose capacity for analysis had impressed me during a seminar. Another is someone I had long wanted to know, but circumstances had not permitted more than a passing acquaintance.

Three people whom I approached about this study declined to participate: one seemed uncomfortable with its phenomenological orientation, another faced the time constraints of a new and heavy teaching load, and a third was deeply interested but seemed depressed, angry, and stressed by the insecurity, isolation, and perceived exploitation of a lecturer's position. My brief conversations with these three may in themselves contain clues to what it is like to be a teacher educator. Time, for example, seems to be viewed as a precious commodity by many teacher educators, a commodity that is rapidly exhausted by the many demands and tasks set by others and by educators themselves.

In addition to telephone conversations and inpromptu dialogue when opportunities occurred, participation in the study has involved an average of six to eight hours of recorded conversation (using audiocassettes) per participant, sometimes over lunch, sometimes in their offices, and on two occasions, in their homes. Three of the participants were also able to arrange opportunities for me to observe their teaching.

In addition, the participants contributed written material. Four people shared documents and course outlines with me, and one participant volunteered to occasionally keep a journal of her experience, stream of consciousness style, thus making an invaluable contribution to this study. At my request, three of the participants wrote one or two short descriptions of particular experiences in their lives as teacher educators. These descriptions, too, proved invaluable. Course syllabuses were formal and technical in style; the descriptions, on the other hand, were very informal and evocative, resembling closely the language of conversation. They had a spontaneous nature that was quite different from the careful wording of the syllabuses.

Two of the participants are people whom I had known

(more than just in passing) for at least six months prior to the interviews. This proved to be a great advantage, eliminating the potential problem of establishing rapport or gaining confidence. These participants were willing to be honest and open immediately and entrusted me with many confidences. Their interviews reached a depth that the others matched only after some time. My prior knowledge of these people facilitated understanding and sharing. I already knew the context in which their remarks were embedded.

The participants include two men and four women from three different Canadian faculties of education (one in the East and two in the West). They range in academic rank from lecturer to full professor, and in university teaching experience, from a few months to over twenty years. Their experience as classroom teachers varies from one to twenty years. Areas of specialization and department affiliation include early childhood education, educational foundations, elementary education, social studies, reading and language arts, literature, and secondary education. In order to protect their identity, the participants were invited to choose their own pseudonyms, enabling me to introduce them now and refer to them subsequently as Rachel, Ilana, Josee, Michael, Ted, and Serena.

This choosing of names was interesting. Three of the participants initially said that any name I chose would do, that they had no preference. After the first interview, however, they all expressed dislike for the pseudonyms I had selected and immediately suggested names more to their liking! Names, even aliases, seem so important to us. In every case but one, the participants chose the name of someone respected or loved. Thus, even names meant to hide an identity are filled with a private meaning and signify an extension of our identity, a way to express who we are or who we would like to be.

The whole idea of pseudonyms and other measures to protect people's privacy was mine. The participants themselves showed no great concern for such matters, indicating perhaps not only their trust, but also their willingness to discover and to reveal. Josee, for example said, "One of the reasons I'm doing this, you know, is to find out more about myself," and Michael asked for copies of some of his interview transcripts, thinking that a record of his latest thoughts concerning teacher education might be helpful in his work. There was an awareness that being interviewed involves thinking aloud, working through, getting to know oneself.

My classroom observations of three of the participants involved a simple and unstructured notetaking. On all three occasions I simply took a seat amongst the students and took notes concerning what was said, the general atmosphere, student participation, and anything else that caught my attention. I was particularly interested in viewing the classes through the professors' eyes, trying to see what they were after, trying to sense how they lived the experience. After each class, I conversed with a few students and then met with the professor to discuss the experience.

In addition to this core group of participants are the several other people who during casual conversations or formal meetings have allowed me to write down or record some of their thoughts. On many occasions, I have found myself hurriedly reaching for pencil and paper, asking colleagues to slow down while I take impromptu notes or set up a tape recorder. These notes and tapes complement the main body of "life material", providing context, counterpoint, and amplification or clarification. The words that motivate me to start taking notes are good indicators of what I perceive as important. They sometimes underline and sometimes call into question the emerging themes. This material is

spontaneous, a seizing of the moment, a recognition of the opportunity for inquiry afforded by my daily life.

A final source of material for this study is a small collection of one and two page scenarios for the future written by a group of teacher educators to express their vision of what their lives as teacher educators should be. These descriptions form part of an internal and confidential departmental document from one of the participating universities which has kindly given me permission to use these scenarios.

II. Interviewing : Some Critical Reflections

Many researchers who rely heavily on open-ended, informal interviewing to gather their data often make only passing reference to the conception and to the lived experience of interviewing, as if interviewing were an easy-to-use and uniform tool, a simple application of well-established, implicitly understood techniques. Anyone who has done a certain amount of interviewing knows that this is simply not so, but we tend to neglect this knowledge when writing our research reports. What is the interview in qualitative research? How is it lived by the researcher? How does it become data? How do we use, abuse, and lose our interviews? In addressing these questions, I shall examine what happens during and after the interview, exploring the nature of the relationship between interviewer and participant and the potential abuse of power that is inherent to the experience.

A. Disclosure and the Balance of Power

Interviewing is one way the researcher attempts to gather life experience material (data) that will be helpful in reflecting on a certain phenomenon. The hermeneutic interview is an attempt to extend and deepen the researcher's understanding of a phenomenon through encountering the

personhood of another. Although through dialogue I encounter another's past experience only indirectly, I do encounter the person directly. For both people, the interview is a lived experience, there is nothing second-hand about it. The interview can be a joint reflection on a phenomenon, thus becoming a sharing or learning experience for both interviewer and participant. But although the interview experience holds a potential for the development of great trust and new understanding, it also holds a potential for an abuse or imbalance of power. On one hand, we run the risk of revealing that which we do not want to reveal. On the other hand, we also run the more welcome risk of gaining valuable insight into what ever it is that we discuss. One of my participants put it this way:

> I find it [interviewing] very hard. I think it's like taking your clothes off in public, yet there's a part of me that wants to do it because I find it very very rewarding in the sense that I can hear myself as well and maybe I can start putting together things that I didn't know I could put together. (iJ-V-2;7-10)

We hear in this excerpt an important acknowledgement of the interview as a mode of learning. We also hear recognition of the very real risks involved. Because exposure is not easily erased and because we may fear what we might learn about ourselves, our efforts to control our appearance may be greater than they usually are. Often, of course, we are

pleased or relieved by what we learn about ourselves and we relax, enjoying the experience and becoming less concerned about appearances, and more concerned with substance, more completely involved.

The risk of exposure, however, and the call to commit one's oral discourse in an exceptional way is usually one-sided in the interview situation, both the researcher and the participant knowing full well that the focus of analysis will be on what the participant says, not on the fumbling words of the interviewer. This perhaps is the heart of the imbalance of power and the potential unfairness of the experience. The interviewer is allowed to keep his or her clothes on, or, failing that, can take consolation in the fact that what is revealed will not show up in print for the world to see. As long as it is the researcher who records, asks the questions, and decides how to deal with the interview material, the balance of power usually remains firmly in his or her hands. For the participant more than for the interviewer, the interview thus involves much risk; yet the willingness of so many to be interviewed must also indicate that it is a risk worth taking. Perhaps this is because for both the participant and the interviewer, the interview offers the opportunity to be known, to gain self-insight, and to make a contribution to understanding.

B. Preconceptions of Interviewing

For many people, the human science research interview is a new experience. In our society, interviewing is perhaps more often associated with intrusive journalism, with job-hunting, or with the manipulative paradigm of experimental psychology. The interview may be perceived as a formal event for which appointments are made and time limits set. The interviewer may be perceived as the one who controls the situation, who is "in the know", who asks the questions, and who influences how we appear and in a sense, who we become. Interviewing may sometimes be perceived as exploitation or as a game in which one person is out to trick the other into revealing that which should not be revealed. The object of the game for the person being interviewed may thus become concealment, the control of appearances; in other words, the very opposite of what the researcher seeks:

> Human beings, as Buber points out,...know how to shut others out; they know how not to reveal themselves to the other. This is especially true when they are confronted with someone who wants to see what makes them "tick".
> (Friedman: 1983, p.174)

The perceptions and preconceptions we have of the interview experience can greatly influence or shape the relationship between participant and interviewer, even

outside the interview situation. To my astonishment, for example, a colleague with whom I feel at ease and whom I greatly respect was suddenly on her best behaviour with me, not quite able to forget my research interest in her:

> I do feel examined and even when we're not interviewing, I think it is colouring our relationship. If I do talk and you happen to be there, I wonder if you're going to use it. (iJ-V-3)

As she said this to me, I realized that as interviewer, I, too, was on my best behavior, not wanting to alienate a valuable participant. It is sometimes difficult to overcome the artificiality of one's assigned roles.

C. Interviewing as Dialogue or Hermeneutic Encounter

Perhaps we need to go beyond such everyday notions of interviewing to its earlier meaning of a "seeing the between" (Fr. entre vue) or meeting to share a viewpoint. As Martin Buber (1966) and Maurice Friedman (1983) remind us, it is the "between" (entre) that reveals, that permits understanding. It is through the seeing of that which is neither only you nor only I but is rather our between that we learn about each other. There is a dialogical and often a dialectical relationship between interviewer and participant and between their perceptions of the phenomena being discussed. Rather then a hindrance to knowledge, this interrelationship is perceived as a way of discovery:

> We address others not by conscious mind or will but by what we are. We address them with more than we know, and they respond -if they really respond- with more than they know. (Friedman: 1983, p.24)

If it is to be more than a game of concealment, the interview must be an authentic dialogue, ideally, a communication between interviewer and participant that evokes the participant's lived experience and that seeks shared understanding of that experience. Such meetings structure themselves in the talking, generating questions and possible interpretations for both participants. Both parties are genuinely present, willing to be known and interested in knowing. Power is more equally shared, for, as anthropologist Miles Richardson (1974) suggests, the participant becomes in a sense the teacher, the one whose job is to teach this stranger what he knows, and although there is an unspoken agreement that the main focus (not the only focus) will be on the participant's experience, the interviewer too takes part in the dialogue. As one of my participants put it:

> We teach one another about ourselves, about our beliefs and our values simply by the way that we conduct ourselves, in the way that we choose to interrelate. That's why in some sense, I suspect, we found a measure of compatibility and harmony right from the start simply because there was that measure of openness that both of us were prepared to provide. (iM-II-6)

The active role accorded the participant does not imply an abdication of responsibility on the part of the researcher who must still assume the ultimate responsibility for the research; it implies, rather, an attitude of respect for the knowledge and the person of the participant; it implies an openness and a willingness to learn. The openness of questioning, however, is never absolute because a question always has a certain direction. For Heidegger, "the very act of posing a question is disclosure, for to question is to sketch in advance the context of meaning in which a particular inquiry will move" (Bossart: 1969, p.269). The answering in turn invites more questioning, also guiding the interview. The interview is thus shaped by both participants, becoming, for the moment, their shared abode.

Because the focus is largely on the participant's experience, the interviewer might say very little, enjoining the dialogue with the meaningful silence of listening and thinking, participating at times more through presence (being) than through speech. The body language of active listening can be a most appropriate way of contributing to a conversation. However, researchers who feel that they should remain noncomittal and silent in order to remain "objective" or to avoid influencing the participant are fooling themselves. Whether we want to or not, we influence people through the many ways we communicate our very being and

presence. No matter who says what or who is silent, the interview is a joint project of interpretive encounter, a common experience shaped by the interaction of two people. In fact, as Buber suggests,

> The more one presents oneself as the detached observer, the less response one will get.... Only as a person, only as a partner in dialogue, will one be able to get any understanding of the other person's wholeness and uniqueness, for it cannot be understood as an object. (Martin Buber quoted in Friedman: 1983, p.174)

Whether as interviewers we admit it or not, we often experience moments of judgement or emotional reaction, silent reactions such as "what a wonderful person" or "what a funny thing to say" or "this is very important" or "how interesting". Other thoughts that greatly contribute to the hermeneutic nature of the interview are those thoughts relating the participant's experience and ideas to our own. "I know how she feels, that happened to me, too " or "how different from my own experience" or " that's how I see it, too". These feelings and thoughts, though often unspoken, form a part of the silent or hidden dialogue of the interview. We cannot and should not be unaffected by what is said, unless of course we are either not listening or are simply denying what we feel.

The interviewer thus strives not to deny his vision of the phenomenon but to recognize it and then put it aside

momentarily in order to participate more fully in the visions of the participant. This is what is meant by "bracketing" or what anthropologist Frederick Erikson (1973) refers to as "disciplined subjectivity". The interview has its best moments when the interviewer and the participant are both caught up in the phenomenon being discussed, when both are trying and wanting to understand. At these times, both people forget the tape-recorder, forget that "this is an interview", and simply talk and listen in a genuine dialogue that is focussed on the phenomenon in question. They are talking to each other rather than past each other. The interviews are very much a we -experience and very much a we- experience that transforms us. The ontological nature of the interview encounter can be powerful and may eventually emerge as the most important data of all.

There are times, of course, when one or both persons are preoccupied, not totally present, as it were. The interviewer, for example, may be too busy trying to be a good interviewer, thinking of what questions to ask or what statements to make. At times I feel self-conscious and nervous, especially during the first interviews. I occasionally worry about how I sound on tape (forgetting that only I listen to them) and become very conscious of the tape recorder, wondering what questions to ask or what to say that will contribute to a good interview. In other words, at the

beginning I may sometimes try too hard, or become too preoccupied with technique, or unthinkingly assume a role. The participant too may be silently wondering, "What is wanted of me? What does the interviewer want me to say?" or even, "Gee, I hope this is over soon." These times too are part of the reality of interviewing. Although they may not fit the idealized image of what an interview should be, they must be accepted and explored as part of the being of the interview itself, a part that can be shared and that can in turn form the basis of new understanding.

In my own experience as interviewer, I usually find that as the participants and I put each other at ease, I soon become completely caught up in the conversations, seeming to feel the participants' feelings, trying to see through their eyes, and concentrating without really needing to make an effort. Flooded with images and ideas that fascinate me, I think about what is said, and ask questions to help clarify or confirm my understanding. Although what I am describing here may illustrate Carl Roger's conceptions of rapport, empathy, and active listening or Martin Buber's concept of "making the other present", giving the experience a name is not always enough to make the experience probable. It is more through dialogue with participants than through studying interview theory and technique that we become truly interviewers. Indeed our skill might depend more on our

interest and curiosity than on our training.

Interviews can continue long after the people we interview have departed. For example, the words of my participants and their presence often linger as I find myself recalling and reflecting on shared moments. My solitary interrogation of their being continues intermittently and at odd moments. In the middle of my grocery shopping or other chores, for example, I may find myself thinking of questions I wish to ask them, of things I wish to know. Some interviews never end. The time they inhabit goes far beyond the clock time of the starting and the stopping of the tape recorder or the meeting and the parting of two people.

As the interviewing progresses, a dialogue between two people evolves into a conversation between three or more people. I often find myself, for example, interrogating one participant in the light of what another person has said, or exclaiming in silent surprise when one participant contradicts or echoes the thoughts of another. Through my mediation, the ideas of participants are exchanged, challenged, tested. I sometimes feel as though I am carrying six people around in my head, eavesdropping on their conversations. This richness of exchange and interrelatedness is seldom explored by researchers but is one of the biggest methodological advantages of interviewing.

In discussing the characteristics of good interviewing, the literature offers much advice. Morris Freilich (1970) stresses the usefulness of asking "how" in order to know "what", and James Spradley (1984) describes five categories of interviewing questions meant to help the participant describe and communicate his or her experience. Humanist models emphasize the importance of rapport, empathy, and authenticity (Rogers: 1951). As part of an active listening to ensure that meaning is shared and to encourage further sharing, the interviewer may sometimes ask questions in the form of interpretive statements (for example, "You're tired, aren't you?"). According to Dohrenwand and Richardson (1964), this involves a calculated but worthwhile risk. If the interviewer's statement is accurate, it does indeed stimulate the participant to talk more about the subject in question. If, on the other hand, the researcher is dead wrong, the participant will usually want to "set the record straight", which of course is very helpful to the researcher. The danger, however, is that when the interviewer's statement is neither right nor wrong, the participant may let it go by without comment or even agree with it because it does not seem important or blatant enough an error to bother correcting.

But to speak of guidelines for the hermeneutic sort of

interview I have been discussing may seem paradoxical given its spontaneous dialogical nature. These guidelines really refer to particular kinds of interactions and attitudes and to some ways of talking. They are not rules that can be mechanically applied, but rather are modes of being that can be recognized. While prior exploration of these guidelines and theorizing might form part of the interviewer's competence, once the interview is underway it is best to forget all conceptions and technique, and to give oneself fully to the experience and to the person at hand. As I have already suggested, a good interview is much more a question of quality of being than a matter of format, structure, technique or formula.

D. <u>After the Interview</u>

In our haste to get at our data, we may overlook or destroy the experience of its very creation. Researchers are perhaps too eager to understand what the participant said, jumping immediately to typed transcripts, substituting without hesitation the printed word for the lived experience, perhaps even re-using their audio tapes and thereby destroying potential access to fuller understanding. They tend to focus their analysis on <u>what</u> was said, forgetting or neglecting <u>how</u> words were said. Ignored too, are the words of the researcher, as if they have nothing to reveal.

Through analysis and writing, interviewers often detach themselves from the original experience, disowning in a sense their own part, feigning a neutrality which betrays the interview. The interview becomes dessicated, reduced to sheets of paper that may or may not cast true enough a shadow to evoke the originating experience. Such treatment of the interview is incongruent with a phenomenological or hermeneutic orientation.

A further potential for abuse lies in the difference between oral and written language. By its very nature, written material usually differs from the oral discourse of an interview. Written accounts are often more polished, coherent, and selective than the more tentative, rambling nature of conversation. In a certain way, written accounts may seem more thoughtful, offering the insightful reflection afforded by the time to think and to choose one's words. In another way, however, it is the conversation of the interview that is sometimes more evocative of lived experience. In spontaneous conversation, it is sometimes the words that almost seem to choose their speaker, offering a more direct access to experience, revealing a complexity of reactions, feelings and thoughts. In writing, there is a drive or tradition to be logical and orderly; the whole endeavour becomes one of disciplined thinking, of depth. In a way, writing is saying, "This is the best I can do", offering us

the fruit of someone's careful consideration. Although in speaking we also try to be orderly, the rapid outpouring of our words may escape the track we set it, revealing ambiguities, confusion, variety, and paradox, offering an authentic mosaic of perceptions and thoughts and providing a sort of window to consciousness. The expression "just thinking aloud" suggests the intimacy and the unfinished nature of oral language, which, of course, is precisely why it can be so revealing and why we seek to interview people.

Although research interviews may be spontaneous conversations, they are at the same time usually recorded and transcribed; they end up written down. An interview thus becomes the spoken word captured with the same permanence as a written document. There is a certain paradox and possibility of betrayal here: participants are implicitly asked to allow their spontaneous, tentative, oral language to be treated as written language, their words committing them to paper for the world to see. But oral commitment does not usually have the same permanence or potential for long term scrutiny as does writing, nor, as I have already suggested, does oral expression allow time for the careful thinking through that writing permits. When I am writing, I may not know what I am going to write until I have written it, but I do have the chance to examine what I have just learned about myself and to decide how to improve it or whether or not I

want to face the new self-knowledge it brings me or if I want to share it. These choices are not usually afforded by the riskier oral discourse of the interview. As a person being interviewed, I can modify and amplify what I have said, but I cannot change the fact that you, the interviewer, have heard me say it and will capture it on paper if you so choose. Moreover, if I were to write about what I have just spoken about, it would probably come out quite differently. Certainly it would be more than a mere transcription of my talking.

Interview transcripts are often lengthy and repetitious. They are full of the half-finished sentences, the repetition and fumbling, the hesitancy, the "uhs" and the "you knows" and the "what do you call its", and the colloquial expressions and the occasional profanities of our everyday oral language. Consequently, the transcripts do not often constitute eloquent reading. And yet, the oral dialogue from which the transcripts are derived may have seemed powerful and clear. Writing down verbatim someone's oral language transforms that language, robbing it at times of its power, clarity, and depth, even its meaning (although perhaps occasionally this transformation may give our words more eloquence or meaning than they had when spoken). The printed word of verbatim transcription makes little accommodation for tone of voice and emphasis, and little

accommodation for the differences in style, words, and form that exists between oral and written modes of communication. What is the researcher's true responsibility here? Should not fidelity to the participants' meaning and to the interview experience take precedence over endless verbatim quotes? Is not part of the research task to make the spoken meaning clear, that is, to remain true to the original aural experience as much as possible? We must struggle with these difficult questions when writing the interpretations and descriptions in our research reports.

Perhaps, for example, the tape recordings combined with written transcripts and notes should be considered the data of preference for analysis. For some interviewers, listening to the tapes helps recapture the tone of voice, the twinkling in the eyes, the pained expression, the cluttered desk, the laughter, the leaning forward, all the things that are lost in a written transcript. For some of us, the spoken word is more evocative, more truly representative of the lived experience to which we wish to remain close. For these reasons, I have found it helpful to review the transcripts <u>while</u> listening to the tapes, writing down initial interpretations, ideas, themes, and more questions. My final interpretations might then remain just a little more faithful to the lives from which they emerge. A further way of remaining faithful to the oral discourse of the interview

might be to edit or even reconstruct the transcript excerpts we use for our reports in such a way as to restore to the writing what was powerful in the telling.

If we continue to view interviewing as central to our research methodology, we must continue to renew and deepen our understanding of the phenomen and continue to face the complications it poses. The potential for the abuse of power in the interview experience is at the same time a potential for developing trust and shared understanding. Which potential is fullfilled depends on the nature of the particular interview experience itself, on the nature of the relationship between interviewer and participant, on the preconceptions and power relations they bring to the interview, and on what happens after the interview is over, when the researcher decides how to deal with the experience. As Breed (1984) wrote in the Human science newsletter ,

> the requirements of our impulse to codify and our professional need to publish and present will always complicate the human dignity celebrated by human science research; the question for us then is with what grace and modesty [and, I would add, justice] we handle the complications. (p.4)

III. Recording and Organizing the Material

A. Recording, Transcribing, and Referencing

Using a portable tape recorder, I taped all of my prearranged interview sessions with the participants. After each interview, I listened to the tape as soon as possible (usually within a few hours) and wrote down any visual detail, comments, or initial reactions that came to mind. I also made note of any questions that I wanted to bring up at the next interview with each participant. In many cases, I was able to have a typed transcript of the meeting ready before the next interview and could read over the transcript and my notes just before our meeting. In some instances, part of one interview would contain a joint reflection on the previous meeting. Most of the time, however, it seemed preferable to allow the current preoccupations of the participant to orient the interview rather than harking back to a previous session. There was no standard time limit for the interviews other than the dictates of other time commitments made by the participants. Usually, the interviews ended when the conversation seemed to come naturally to an end, when we had, in a sense, "finished" talking about whatever had claimed our attention that session. Some of the interviews lasted over two hours as we became engrossed in our topics and forgot about time and the rest of the world.

As indicated earlier, there were also occasions when I did not have my tape recorder but heard or participated in conversations that seemed important to this project. In such instances, I relied on my own written records and have accumulated a file of remarks, phrases, and short exchanges, similar in nature to the notes made by ethnographers. The bulk of material for this study, however, remains the recorded interviews. I transcribed most of the interviews using a date, a pseudonym, and an interview number for easy reference. I made photocopies of each transcript in order to write directly on them without fear of ruining an only copy.

The written material (course outlines, diary entries, short stories or descriptions, and even poetry) given to me by the participants was another important source of "life material". It too was searched for themes and meaning, marginal notes and underlinings revealing the first tentative interpretations.

In order to help the reader identify the source of the material which is used to directly support my interpretations, I devised the following reference system:

The first letter of the reference will be a lower case letter to indicate source:

i = interview transcript;
o = classroom observation notes;
c = notes of conversations with teacher educators
w = written material submitted by the participants;
j = my own journal notes;
s = scenarios for the future written by teacher educators.

When referring to interviews, written submissions, and classroom observation material, the lower case letter will be followed by one upper case letter to identify the pseudonym of the participant to whom reference is being made:

I = Ilana;
J = Josee;
M = Michael;
R = Rachel;
S = Serena
T = Ted.

For each participant, interviews and written documents are numbered in chronological order. The interview or document number will be indicated by a roman numeral following a hyphen the separates it from the source and person indicator. Thus, iM-II refers to Michael's second interview.

For all types of references, a final hyphen will then preceed the page number indicating the location of the material, for example, wJ-I-3 refers to page three of the first written document submitted to me by Josee.

B. Reviewing the Material

The search for themes and a deeper understanding of the

material included the following procedures:

1. Complete, unmarked copies of the interview transcripts were kept at hand for frequent reference, enabling me to come back to the material as a whole with a "fresh eye". Interpretations and questions were made on a second copy of the transcript. I read through all of Michael's unmarked transcripts in the course of a few days, then all of Ilana's and so on. This helped me develop a feel for each of the participants and helped me see the general context of their remarks. The process permitted me to notice similarities and differences and recurring expressions and concerns. After a month of analysing particular segments of certain transcripts, I would return to a complete reading of the unmarked transcripts. By the end of the research, I knew the five hundred pages of transcripts almost by heart. This procedure lends a certain confidence to my final interpretations.

2. Because interpretation inevitably begins during the interviews, I was able to question participants in the light of my initial interpretations, asking for their clarifications and opinions, enabling all of us to test our ideas and continue our dialogue. The focus was on ensuring a clear understanding of what the participants and I meant.

The aim of our interviews was to describe and understand our lived experience as teacher educators.

3. As I have indicated in the previous section on interviewing, the tapes combined with the written transcripts and notes seemed the data of preference for analysis in this study. I thus started reading the transcripts while listening to the tapes, writing down initial interpretations, ideas, themes, and more questions. As I listened, I circled or underlined what appeared to be key phrases in the transcripts, words that stood out or intrigued me. I would often stop the tape in order to think about these phrases, seeking and then writing in the margins their possible meanings or significance. (I rapidly became aware of the importance of leaving wide margins!) These reviewed transcripts represent what could be called the first phase of analysis and formed the basis for further interpretation. This procedure, while time-consuming, is another way of increasing the potential for faithful interpretation.

4. After marking and remarking copies of the transcripts as just described, I made lists of possible themes on separate sheets of paper, using the participants' own words as much as possible. As I reread through sections of transcripts, I would circle or underline additional material that related in any way to those themes, either by lending additional support

or clarification, or by throwing into question their importance, meaning, or validity.

5. Photocopying the marked transcripts, conversation notes, and the other material enabled me then to sort the pages according to themes (the photocopies were necessary because a page may touch on more than one theme). The initial result was twenty-one theme piles drawn from all the data. These piles shifted in size and number as themes were linked, evaluated, added to or changed. Keeping the data in units no smaller than a page forced me always to read a passage in context and reminded me of other themes to which the passage was related. This sorting and cross referencing was very time-consuming. Perhaps not all of it was necessary. It seemed at times to be an overly reductive process that encouraged me to view our experience as a collection of categories. A hermeneutic approach to interpretation demands that we consider the whole and the parts simultaneously. This is very hard to do. I found returning frequently to the whole unmarked transcripts helpful in this regard. Putting it all aside, and spending time just thinking was perhaps most helpful of all.

C. Quoting the Participants

In the section on interviewing, I suggested that part of the researcher's responsibility is to make the participants' intended meanings clear; to remain faithful to the aural context of the interview experience. For these reasons, I have partially edited some of the transcript excerpts, not in order to make them say what I want them to mean, but rather to restore the power and the meaning of the original oral version. I have kept the editing to a minimum where possible and have used the following standard devices to alert the reader:

[ ] - words enclosed in this type of bracket are my own clarifications;

... - signifies that a portion of the transcript has been omitted;

___ - means these words were spoken with emphasis.

The transcripts contain some evocative stories that needed more extensive editorial assistance if they were to emerge as wholes. In order to release their inherent meaning, I partially reconstructed some of these stories, sometimes slightly rearranging the order of some sentences, eliminating unnecessary repetition, or incorporating the participants' important descriptions and clarifications from later

interviews and so on. The intent was not to alter the stories, merely to find them and give them a viable written form. This careful reconstuction of stories uses the words and style of their original telling. The written stories were shown to the participants for their suggestions and approval. Reconsructions are clearly marked as such at the end of the story.

IV. Describing and Interpreting

> My contention is that descriptions and explanations, whether lay or scientific, provide only persuasive versions of the world. (Silverman: 1975, p.24)

A. Concerning Description and Interpretation

In this study, I strive not only to give an accounting or description that faithfully evokes the lived experience of teacher educators, but also to reflect on the meaning of that experience. The difficulty of such an endeavour is in:

> trying to pick the right form of communication for, on the one hand, the reproduction of experience, and, on the other, the expression of one's own interpretation of that experience aided by one's own stock of knowledge. (Smith: 1979, p.38)

Also problematic is the conventional research wisdom suggesting that description and interpretation are separate processes. This separation reflects a prevailing

subject/object dichotomy. However, if one accepts (as both physicists and phenomenologists now do) the interrelatedness of human perception and all phemomena, and if one views human existence as essentially the seeking of and participating in meaning, then any conception of description as totally divorced from interpretation become ludicrous. Description and interpretation are not mutually exclusive processes. Description presupposes some sort of understanding of that which is to be described.

The interpretative process in this study, for example, has already started by the first interview. The interviewer attends to the participant's view and responds to it. To assure that the listening is a "true" listening, the interviewer may often rephrase what the participant has said or offer a personal interpretation. The intent is to tell the participant that "I'm listening. This is what I've understood of what you've said. Is this what you mean?" Interpretation is also rooted in the questions asked by the interviewer, marking the value or importance to the interviewer of certain ideas and directions, and thus at least momentarily revealing the themes that are beginning to emerge.

The words "description" and "interpretation" are perhaps more properly viewed as reflecting a shift in emphasis:

description strives to capture the flavour and "essence" of an experience, to recreate what the experience is like. Interpretation continues that process by seeking variations of the experience, and by interrogating the experience, searching for and making explicit its deepest meanings and its implications for human existence. The actual use of the words description and interpretation in research reports suggests that they are sometimes meant to refer more to format or style or to different sections of a paper than to specific processes or procedures.

B. Evocative Description

A description is a creative act involving selection and communication. This most difficult task involves creating an appropriate accounting, a true-to-life telling that evocatively recreates the lived experience of the participants and of the researcher. Neither the anthropologist, the phenomenologist, nor the naturalistic observer seeks to overwhelm readers with hundreds of pages of field notes. The descriptive task is to recognize and choose the most telling bits, and to write about them in a manner that faithfully conveys the essence of what was seen, experienced, or discovered. Writing description means including "everything" without having to write everything; it means including all the layers of experience, as in Geertz's

(1973) concept (after Ryle and Malinowski) of thick description. There should be depth.

The descriptions that form an important part of this study evolved from the following activities:

carefully listening and observing during interviews and classroom observations;

making detailed notes of classroom observations;

making detailed notes shortly after the interviews;

repeatedly listening to the tapes while reading typed transcripts of the interviews, trying to develop a sound "feel" for the data;

carefully writing and <u>rewriting</u> , a continual asking of oneself, "is that how it is?"

As a further step towards writing faithful descriptions, I asked the participants for their reactions to my interpretations and my writing. There was frequent dialectical interchange.

Although all of these measures are helpful and may increase the value of the descriptions, none of them in themselves ensure valid, useful description. Ultimately, much depends on the willingness and ability of the participants to share their experience and on the researcher's perceptiveness, insight, and writing ability. The validity of the description lies in the degree to which the description reveals itself as an authentic human

experience.

C. Interpretation: The Search for Themes and Meaning

> What is needed in...interpretation is a dialectical questioning which does not simply interrogate the text but allows the thing said in the text to interrogate back, to call the interpreter's own horizon into question and to work a fundamental transformation of one's understanding of the subject. (Palmer: 1969, p. 234)

In the tradition of hermeneutic phenomenology, interpretation involves a dialogue of sorts between the life material and the researcher, and requires interaction between the researcher's constant questions of "what do I see?" and "how is it that I come to see it that way?" Through listening repeatedly to the tapes, through reading and rereading transcripts and making notes, and more especially through writng evocative descriptions, I gradually saw themes or possible interpretations emerge. These themes were explored and verified through such activities as

> cross-checking through the data for corroborating or negating experience;
>
> asking of myself and of others: Is that how it is?
>
> probing for additional data with the participants;
>
> comparing their experiences to each other and to my own experience;
>
> systematically varying the themes through reflection (asking, for example, how the phenomenon would be affected if a particular aspect were different, or were

removed, or were not true);

relating the themes to the phenomenon as a whole and setting them in context (facilitated by the fact that I always had an unmarked and complete transcript for reference);

writing about the themes, giving supporting quotations or descriptions that show the interpretation as plausible;

referring to pertinent writing by other authors;

critically reevaluating, and rewritng;

sharing these interpretations with the participants for their evaluation.

D. Writing and Rewriting

Ethnographers and phenomenologists recognize the need to adapt the methodology and the communication of findings to the needs of each particular study (see, for example, Marcus:1980). There is no one format that is de rigueur (Spiegelberg: 1975). Much attention has been given recently to the suitability of literary forms for research reports. Harré (1978), for example, has asserted that the activities of the poet and the playwright offer the human science researcher a better model than those of the physical scientist, and Richardson (1981) has suggested that the stance of the ethnographer should be the stance of the myth teller. Ross (1981) draws a most interesting parallel between the praxis of teacher, researcher, and storyteller. Each must eventually draw together one story. Each is

involved in a critical mediation of reality. She quotes Walter Benjamin who wrote so eloquently in "The Storyteller":

> A story ...does not expend itself. It preserves and concentrates its strength and is capable of releasing it even after a long time.
> (Benjamin: 1968)

Valerie Polokow (1985) suggests that "to live outside of the story is to live outside of the lived world of meaning". Through the power of metaphor, stories point to the meaning of our lives as we live them, illuminating and indeed changing them. Perhaps that is why many researchers are praising the suitability of the metaphor and of metaphorical language for human science reporting and interpretation:

> This metaphorical language serves the same purpose as the language of poetry, namely to create certain images which could convey metaphorically subtle meanings not transmittable by common or scientific language.
> (Weckowicz: 1981, p.61)

The literary ability of the author as well as strategies of organizing material can thus be important to an adequate interpretation. Marcus (1980) has suggested that:

> a discussion of variations in ethnography's rhetorical style is just as important for assessing the strengths and limitations of any particular work as an evaluation of its logic and evidence.(p.509)

This applies, as well, to phenomenological research. Loren Barritt (1985), for example, has suggested that human science research could be better understood as a rhetorical process than as a scientific one. He also asserts the impossibility in research reporting of escaping a rhetorical stance and of making rhetorical choices, saying that "in the name of truth we avoid artifice and in the process achieve a greater artifice". In a similar vein, Valerie Polokow (1985) decries the theoretical mystification and intellectual posturing of so much of our educational research writing, saying that we are witnessing the "demeaning of meaning".

In describing phenomenological research, David Denton (1979) writes:

> Phenomenological research does not yield abstract theory; it does yield what Habermas calls generalizable narrative.... Phenomenological research will ... provide a many-layered narrative against which the teacher and administrator can draw parallels with their worlds of practice. (p.14)

Although emergent themes should be revealed as they relate to the supporting data (usually direct quotations), simply listing themes in a dry manner as headings for columns of quotations usually does not do justice to the richness, complexity, and meaning of our lives. The texture of the

experience, indeed its very meaning slips away through the gaping holes of so sparse a framework. The form of the final analysis should be woven tightly enough to retain the flavour and essence of lived experience. It may be abstract, but it must be the sort of symbol that points clearly to the life from which it emerges. The purpose of theory is to illuminate, to uncover meaning for practical action. It cannot do so from afar, but must remain close to that to which it speaks.

As the material, themes, and initial interpretations for this study grew over the course of a two year period, important questions arose concerning what form the final communication (thesis) should take, how best to answer the question, "What is it to be a teacher educator?" At first, I wrote about each of the major aspects or structures (themes) that I had uncovered, thinking that that would be an appropriate way. But I found that in exploring each theme separately, something was missing. The complexity of the lived experience and the interrelatedness of the themes was difficult to convey adequately. After much re-writing, reflection, and discussion with other researchers, I chose the story as the best vehicle of phenomenological interpretation for this study.

On the surface, the participants and I appear to be

theorizers, not storytellers. We speak of why people do things or should do things. We discuss the implications of things. What we seldom do is talk concretely about the whatness of things, about the specific details of how we actually experience things. Passing over the concrete description of our everyday experience as that which we all know and can therefore take for granted, we eagerly and immediately skip to explaining, understanding, generalizing. In so doing, we often use a vast repertoire of terminology. What is evident in listening to the participants, however, is that our terminology does have personal meaning, evoking very real but private images for each of us. Our language may be abstract; the way we talk, however, is often passionate and expressive,

When I looked carefully through the transcripts and documents, I found that despite all the philosophy and theorizing, there were indeed some vivid accounts-- stories-- that affirm the power of concrete description to illuminate the meaning of our lives. My task as researcher thus became to select, present, and discuss the most telling stories, stories that illustrate significant moments of our lives. Some of the stories, as I have already explained, have been reconstructed from transcripts and conversations in order to preserve in writing what was powerful in the telling. One or two of them were written for me by the participants

themselves, when it finally occurred to me to ask them for stories that illustrate what they feel it is like to be a teacher educator, in particular the best times and the worst times. The stories are gifts, bits of reflected lived experience offered to me by the participants to enrich and extend my own experience. In a very real sense, then, they have become my stories, too. A story, once told, becomes a story the listener may in turn retell. Perhaps the reader too will wish to take possession of some of the stories, finding they strike a resonant chord.

CHAPTER FOUR STORIES FROM OUR LIVES

A careful listening to the stories told here suggests that there are common themes and threads to the participants' professional lives, aspects of their existence that speak to all teacher educators, and yet, each person is uniquely different. Being with Michael is very different from meeting with Rachel. Ted's presence is very different from Serena's. Although their horizons overlap, they each have their own specific way of viewing the world. What I have learned about the participants is, of course, also related to my own way of being and to the dialogue we enjoined. Josee as I know her, for example, is perhaps different in some ways from Josee as her children or other colleagues know her.

The stories retain the complexity and flavour of experience, evoking its wholeness as we unravel the threads of its meaning. I did not choose each story as a symbol to sum up the meaning of its author's life. What I have done is to select stories that collectively illustrate significant moments of our lived experience as teacher educators. All the hours of interviewing and the hundreds of pages of transcripts that are not included in the stories serve as the

context or backdrop that helps me present and reflect upon the stories in a way that remains faithful to the lives from which the stories emerged. Each story also illuminates the other stories, revealing commonalities and differences. One story sometimes amplifies what is only a faint echo in another story or sheds sudden significance on what at first might have seemed unimportant. Taken together, the stories eloquently address my research questions.

Here then are the stories. Each one is followed by some initial reflections, and each reflection draws upon those of the previous stories, creating a dialogue that leads to a gradual deepening of our understanding of the lives of teacher educators. As questions or themes emerge, I return to the interviews and to the written material again and again for additional help. I have also interwoven some reflections concerning current issues or research in teacher education with the interpretations that emerge. As might be expected from a hermeneutic study such as this one, answering some questions immediately raises others.

I. A Story by Ilana

The Little Boy who Loved to Draw

One day, I accidentally came across a rather long poem while browsing through a book in the curriculum center. The poem is about a little boy in kindergarten who loves to draw pictures. When told by the teacher that the class was going to draw flowers, the little boy becomes very excited and starts to draw all sorts of flowers of many colours. "Wait!" says the teacher, "until I show you how", and she proceeds to make a very stereotypic sort of flower on the chalkboard and colours it red. The other children all start to copy the teacher's flower. The little boy looks at the teacher's flower, them looks at his own. He much prefers the ones he drew, but finally decides to turn his sheet over and make one like Teacher's. The same thing happens when on another day, the teacher announces they are to draw trees. The little boy is happy and draws all sizes and manners of trees, some of them with purple leaves. "Wait!" says the teacher. Once again he prefers his drawings and once again he is gently "corrected" and so on. The little boy learns to wait and copy Teacher's demonstration, and he never again ventures to produce his own wonderful creations. Eventually, he stops feeling the urge to draw at all or to think for himself.

I found the poem powerful and moving. To me, it beautifully illustrates some of the main things I had been trying to point out to my education students, the difference between creative art activities, how we often unthinkingly stifle creativity and force children to depend on us, robbing them of their autonomy and their uniqueness and so on. Here, suddenly, was a poem that said in a few words what I had been spending hours trying to get across.

I read the poem to my students the very next day and the effect was electric. You could have heard a pin drop. All around the room, eyes were lighting up with recognition and heads were nodding in agreement. Even before the ensuing discussion, I know that they had finally understood. There was a special bond between us, as if we all felt the same way....We all recognized the conspiracy. We all condemned it, and yet, we all knew we were in danger of becoming part of it ourselves. They all wanted a copy of the poem and one of them said: "I want to hang it right over my workspace as a constant reminder to me when I prepare my lesson plans".

I felt so happy, so pleased at having found a way to communicate. I guess I felt proud of having found that poem, of having offered it to them. Almost as proud as if I had written it myself....But somehow I knew deep down that all this wasn't enough. All those nodding heads wouldn't amount to a hill of beans if their practice, their own teaching remained unexamined, untouched by the poem. What I find so frustrating about university teaching is that we rarely get to see what effect, if any, our teaching has.

Well, anyway, a few weeks later, when they returned from a visit in the schools, many of the students had recognized and constructively criticized examples of practice like that in the poem. They had not been asked to. I wasn't involved in their going to the schools and hadn't given them any assignment or anything....But I could see from the excellent criticisms and suggestions they volunteered that they had incorporated something of the poem, or its message into their own way of viewing teaching. They were full of stories of what they had seen and done, of the times they or others had stifled and restrained the children's thinking, and of what they had done to try and change that. The poem wasn't just pretty words to cry over and then forget. It was something they were applying to their own lives. My satisfaction at that moment was immense and deep. I began to think that because of my course, maybe some of them would really be more sensitive to children's need to create. That was one of those times when I felt closest to truly being a teacher educator. (iI-III-9-13)

Reflections:

A. The Joy of Knowing

In a private moment of discovery, Ilana is moved by a poem she finds both intellectually and emotionally powerful. Someone else has put into words that which, at some level, she already knew. The poem seems to deepen what she knows, helping her see it more clearly than before, and giving her words in which to express it. The poem

illuminates pedagogical practice in a way that theory often does not and confirms her as knower, telling her, "It is as you believe; your insight is true". Ilana experiences the simple yet profound joy of knowing.

What Ilana has learned, or at least rediscovered, is not trivial. The significance of her knowledge lies in it's relevance to her life and to the lives of her students. This relevancy lends an importance and an urgency to what she knows, and the poem becomes a precious possession in which she takes great pleasure; it becomes her poem. Part of the joy of learning perhaps lies in the personal fulfillment we find in knowing. However "objective" or "scientific" our knowledge may be, it is our knowledge, that which we know.

The sort of joy Ilana feels reflects a commitment to personal learning and inquiry that is made by many teacher educators. Josee, for example, spoke in one of our interviews of the elation she felt in making new connections between the poetry and music that she loves so much. Ted, too, talked joyfully of new links he was continually discovering across disciplines and of his exciting ideas about teaching. Michael seizes any opportunity to talk about his beloved history and philosophy of education and he

mentions the deep satisfaction he feels every time he successfully works out a careful, reasoned argument. It is perhaps the personal joy we experience through our commitment to learning that permits us to continually renew that commitment, giving that special spark to our professing.

Some of us may find that this joy in learning is too often missing from our professional lives. When this happens, there may be a weakening of personal commitment and purpose that needs to be recognized. Joy in learning (or its absence) might be a helpful clue in evaluating the effects of the politics and structure of university life. Perhaps we need to ask ourselves how we can make more room for joy in our busy lives; perhaps as administrators and professors we need to start looking for ways to foster and to celebrate not the product of learning so much as the joy in learning.

B. Of Confirmation, Learning, and Teaching

Ilana's story underlines the relationship between a teacher educator's own learning and his or her teaching. Almost immediately, Ilana wants to share the poem with her students. She sees in a flash that the poem can be a pedagogical means of reaching her students, of sharing a meaningful experience with them. How satisfying it is to

have something of significance to offer! Here, beautifully illustrated, is the momentum that the joy of knowing gives to our teaching. Perhaps because of that momentum and the joy of shared meaning, special bonds develop between the student and professor. These bonds are forged from the personal way we are involved in important new insights, from the deep excitement or joy or urgency we feel in this knowing, and most importantly, from our desire to share not only what we know, but the lived experience of that knowing. Phenix (1964) writes of his university teaching:

> I cannot expect to awaken in my students a lively response to something that I do not really get excited about myself. I cannot arouse interest in my students for anything in which I have no great interest....I am only ready [for teaching] when I have so lived my way into what is to be treated in the class that I feel an urgency and an excitement about it that I want to share. (p.24)

Phenix speaks of university teaching as "celebration", as a transaction "in which teacher and students together constitute a gathered community lifted to a heightened level of understanding by common active engagement with symbolic materials of substantial human significance" (p.23)

In sharing her poem, Ilana is not simply pointing to some outside content in a one-way monologue. She is opening herself to her students, and in so doing turns a potential monologue into an authentic dialogue, creating a "we-ness" or

"between". In what van Manen (1977) refers to as a "co-orientational grasping", a view of the world is truly shared, however momentarily. At such times, like Ilana and her students, we feel understood and confirmed. "See how it is", we are really saying, showing our students a new way to view their lives as teachers. And it appears that they do see, that they catch a glimpse of the image shown by our saying. Yet in that saying, we are also asking a question. The "see how it is" becomes, also, "is this how it is? What do you think of what I see? How does my interpretation or knowledge measure up in the light of your knowledge, of your experience?" What Ilana learns, she immediately wishes to share, and in that sharing, she searches for yet further insight into that which she knows. For the teacher educator, teaching is yet another way to learn about teaching and about oneself; for in the giving, we hope not only to show something to our students, but also to test ourselves by authentically turning to our students as trusted partners in dialogue. Through encounter, we seek what Maurice Friedman (1983), after Martin Buber(1965), calls confirmation:

> Mutual confirmation is essential to becoming a self-- a person realizes his uniqueness precisely through his relation to other selves...True confirmation means that I confirm my partner as this existing being even while I oppose him.... This mutual confirmation is most fully realized in what Buber calls "making present"... Making the other present means to "imagine the real", to imagine quite concretely what another person is

> wishing, feeling, perceiving, and thinking. (pp.8-9)
>
> To exist as human beings we must, as long as we live, enter ever anew into the flowing interchange of confirming and being confirmed, of addressing and responding.... We need to be confirmed in our uniqueness as what we are, who we can become, and what we are called to become, and this can only be known in the give and take of living dialogue. (pp.40-41)

To the extent that teaching is a search for confirmation, teaching is also a mode of becoming. As we shall see later in other stories, this testing or search for confirmation involves risk and may be painful. Who we are can be called into question. Those to whom we turn for confirmation may withold their presence or be unable to make us present. In understanding the risk, we then doubly appreciate Ilana's joy and deep satisfaction in the enthusiastic and active response of her students. This time, for her, the risk was worth it.

C. Pointing the Way: teaching as the expression of our pedagogical hope for the future

The way in which Ilana tells her story evokes a sense of joyful pride. This is not a boastful or vain pride. It is more like a surprised sense of pleasure in the real possibility that her students' learning may have had something to do with her teaching. What pleased Ilana most was not that her students had understood what she had

"taught", but that they seem to have been moved by her teaching to action on their own initiative in the best interests of children. Rather than viewing her theorizing as a recipe to be applied, they drew from it a guiding inspiration for their own teaching practice.

In sharing her poem, Ilana is clearly trying to point the way towards the kind of teacher she hopes her students will become. It is as if she wishes to indirectly touch the lives of children by profoundly influencing in some way the practice of the future teachers who are her students. Her deepest satisfaction rests in the hope that she has inspired her students to be better teachers than they might otherwise have been. Through the success of her students, Ilana feels confirmed as a teacher of teachers. In pointing a way, she feels she has truly taught her students; she has touched the lives of teachers and perhaps even the lives of children in a pedagogical way. How satisfying it is to live in this hope!

What is this desire to touch the lives of our students and children? What does it signify? It seems to reflect our need to contribute creatively to the future of the world. Erik Erikson (1963) refers to this interest in establishing and guiding the next generation as "generativity", and he describes it not only as physical

procreation, but also as productivity, creativity, and caring for one's part of the world. Through generativity, we give meaning to our lives while leaving something of ourselves behind.

The desire to generate is also an expression of our pedagogical hope for the future. We wish to change the world, to narrow the gap between what is and what ought to be, to act on the hopes to which we are committed. These desires are complex and have many implications. For example, there is a very delicate line, as we shall see later, between opening doors or pointing a way, and exhortation and preaching. In later chapters, I shall discuss generativity and the desire for change in the schools and suggest that although the twin threads of change and preservation may seem paradoxical, they are actually complementary aspects of the same whole.

From Ilana's story an image of university-based teacher education begins to emerge. The teacher educator's teaching is revealed simultaneously as joy in learning, as sharing what one learns, as seeking confirmation, and as pointing out a truth or a way to one's students, expressing hope not only for their future, but also for the future of the children they will teach.

II. Stories Told by Rachel

Brown Bear, Brown Bear

During a course associated with the practicum, I talked to my students about how to expand children's language learning. Even if you are working in a kindergarten doing fine motor activities, you can still be giving the children language activities all the time by talking to them and taking them from where they are to something new, expanding on their own natural language activity. I talked to my students about alternate ways of looking at children's literacy in terms of using big books and whole language experiences with children rather than fragmenting emergent literacy into teaching the alphabet and teaching letter sounds. Some of the students reject this almost immediately as soon as they go out into the classroom and see that letter sounds are being taught in the schools. They feel safer with the program guides, staying within the confines of whatever is done in the classrooms where they do their practice teaching.

Something very special happened on a call-back from the schools. One student, Tara, brought me back a study of a child with whom she had been working, a cerebral palsy child who had a terrible language difficulty. He had some speech problems; hardly anyone could understand him. Tara had made a really big book, her own version of Brown bear, brown bear, a Bill Martin book. She had made this book herself, trying to weave in fine motor control activities and trying to weave in some literacy or language extension opportunities as well. The book was very, very beautiful. The first page had this brown bear with a little brown bobbing tail and eyes that moved, so that you could work with it at so many different levels as you read the book. You could talk about bears and brownness and the child could talk along as you read, but also there were so many things you could manipulate as you went along. On the next page, there was a beautiful, vibrant red bird with real feathers on its head and two tail feathers coming out of it which the child could take out and feel.... On another page was a purple cat. The purple cat had a rough coat you could touch and had pipe cleaners as whiskers which you could bend into a smiling cat or a sad cat with the whiskers drooping down. There was a yellow duck in the story who had a wing you could move to make it fly and so on.

I was so excited by her idea, by her material, but when we listened to the teaching tapes she had recorded while using the material with the child... I think tears actually came to my eyes, I was so utterly delighted. The joy in this child's voice as he tried to join in as she worked with him, "brown bear, brown bear what do you see?" He was always trying to join in, and when he saw the purple cat, well, he just cried out, "Oooooooh". The ecstacy in his voice, the tone of his voice, you could just see his eyes light up. As Tara listened to the tape with me, her eyes just lit up too as she re-lived the experience. She was joyful (on the tape)... well, at first you could hear a tentativeness to her voice, but then you could hear what I feel is a true interaction. The child was expressing interest in the story, joining in with the words, however limited his speech was, he was joining in, and then his excitement, his joy at seeing the next picture and the escalation in her ability to connect to the child. He laughs, and then she laughs, and he picks up, and she picks up, and then he picks up. It was almost like a communicative deepening of the interaction. She so beautifully expanded the child's language experience. It was an enriching experience, clearly, for both the child and the teacher.

This child is a child who seldom seems involved in anything,...who has had a fair amount of emotional trauma in his life, who does not engage easily, and who is very distractable. At school, they had therefore been trying to limit the stimulation in his environment; yet here was this book that was so highly stimulating and it clearly engaged him. I felt, "Wow! I could die right now, I could do nothing more!" I felt so excited by the fact that she had integrated some of the theoretical ideas I had given her into a very fine teaching/ learning interaction with a child. I think it was a very special moment, and in fact, I asked her if I could have a copy of the tape to play in moments when I felt down. I thought that it was such a perfect example of how somebody can use a theory to generate something that is so perfectly appropriate for a child, a pedagogical interaction that engages the child wholely, both cogitively and emotionally, in the activity. And I felt she'd done it. (reconstructed from iR-III)

Reflections:

A. The Joy of Learning and Teaching Revisited

Inspired perhaps by Rachel's teaching and responding to the call of the child's need, a student teacher creates a book with care and hope and pedagogical concern. In making and sharing the book, there is learning and teaching. "Oooooh", says the child with joy and understanding in one of those moments for which a teacher lives. Inspired by the child, the teacher is able to respond pedagogically because she now better understands, she sees what to do, and is thus joyful, too. Perhaps also lingering in the back of her mind is the suddenly meaningful trace of Rachel's teaching. Gifts of shared joy and understanding have been exchanged, and a reciprocal reaction is set in motion. Tara then shares the tape with Rachel and relives the joy. The student teacher is, in a way, teaching the teacher educator who also responds with joy and deeper understanding, thus helping Tara learn further and so on. The communicative interaction Rachel sees between Tara and the child is recreated between student teacher and teacher educator. There is reciprocity and a meaningful "between" in their pedagogical being together. Once more, learning and teaching emerge as intimately related, almost mirror reflections of each other, parts of an inseparable whole.

In an ecstatic voice, Rachel proclaims, "Wow! I could die right now, I could do nothing more." It is in seeing our students joyfully learning on their own and in their becoming able to teach us, that we seem to draw closest to fullfilling our pedagogical mission. When we have fulfilled our generative purpose, we are content. The torch has been passed on, we can do "nothing more". We are confirmed in our professional calling as teachers of teachers.

B. The Need for Evocative Illustration in Teaching

In telling her story, Rachel occasionally uses technical terms, words that some might call jargon. At first, we may wonder just what she means by "expanding language activities" or "big book approach" or "whole language experience", but as her story unfolds, we begin to get a clearer image of the lived experience to which she refers. Her terminology takes on deeper meaning as we share Rachel's vision of the interaction between teacher and child. The concrete and evocative description in the story prepares us for the abstract language, helping us intuit the meaning of "a communicative deepening of the interaction", or "emergent literacy". We see in Rachel's story a good example of the depth of meaning that can lie behind our professional discourse. To Rachel, the terms she uses are not merely

jargon. Like Ilana's use of a poem, Rachel shows us how the use of evocative examples can make our theorizing more meaningful and precise.

Rachel's and Ilana's ability to evoke the experience underlying their theorizing inadvertently points to what seems to be missing in some of our university teaching. At times, we seem to take for granted that the abstract language we use has the same vivid meaning for our listeners that it has for us. Perhaps this is not always the case, even among colleagues. At times, we may also misunderstand as listeners, thinking that the images we privately conjure up as we listen to the technical discourse of a colleague match the speaker's lived but unspoken meaning. Even worse, as writers and as speakers, we ourselves can sometimes unknowingly lose sight of the lived experience from which our theories and abstract language emerged. Our own understanding thus becomes impoverished, falling away from the deep insight we may once have had. When this happens, our once meaningful professional language becomes empty and we may fool ourselves into thinking we know something when all we have is jargon. As a consequence, the lifeless language of our communication can have little meaning or relevance to others. Perhaps this is what underlies some of those occasions when students complain that a class is not "relevant", or is "too theoretical". Perhaps this partially

explains those painful moments when we suspect that our listeners find us boring or simply do not understand what we are saying. By giving more frequent and evocative illustrations of theorizing, we make our communication clearer. In so doing, we are less able to ignore the meaning or lack of meaning in our speaking, we are forced to continually reevaluate and renew our own understanding.

C. Theory and Practice

In Ilana and Rachel, we sense a concern for the quality of our pedagogical being with children. Their stories describe events which indirectly brought them closer to children. Like many teacher educators, they are concerned about the relationship between theory and practice. The theories they present to future teachers are ones which they feel will lead towards "good" practice in the schools and touch the lives of children in a positive way. Yet, Rachel is almost surprised to see what she calls so "perfect" a lived example of her theory. At least unconsciously, teacher educators sometimes seem to doubt the truth or the completeness of their theories of human experience, especially when those theories seem contrary to current practice in the field. As we shall see later in Josee's story, we need to test what we think we know; we need to see our theories illustrated more often perhaps than our daily

existence usually permits. Hence Rachel's and Ilana's delight when their students relate their professor's theorizing to their own lives, showing it to be meaningful and practical. Often isolated from direct contact with children, we search as teacher educators for the confirmation of our pedagogical dreams through the actions of others. Rachel thus experiences the deep joy of confirmation as knower when her theory in a sense comes to life, when what Buber calls "the imagined" becomes "the real". She desires a copy of the tape, so that she might, in a sense, recapture at will this deeper understanding, for she knows that such opportunities for confirmation do not often occur. Do we as teacher educators perhaps deny ourselves these opportunites in the way we organize and live our daily professional lives?

Rachel's story speaks to Ilana's story, amplifying and contributing further to the images of teaching that Ilana introduced. We now sense the depth of personal meaning that can underly our terminology; the desire we have to see our theoretical knowledge confirmed in teaching practice; the joy and generative fullfillment we find in our students' learning; the importance of evocative illustration to teaching; and, once again, the desire to indirectly touch the lives of children through our work with education students.

Now, in a second story by Rachel, we turn to another side of our lives as teacher educators. The story describes a "problem case" in Rachel's experience, one of those situations which, although not frequent, haunt us and intrigue us and bother us. The story captures the feelings of frustration and helplessness that we all encounter from time to time when an unusual experience forces us to confront the limitations of our power and skill.

Like Wallpaper Paste

By Rachel

I received a phone call last night from Amy, a practicum student. Amy does beautiful planning; she can churn out a series of lesson plans like links from a sausage machine. She has beautiful classroom organization; in fact, except for communication and self-evaluation on which I rate her quite low, she's got all those things we check for on the rating scales. But that essence in teaching, that quality of human interaction, she doesn't have that. It's very hard to numerically evaluate essence, we don't have a box for it on our forms! So I know she is going to pass the practicum, because technically, she's all right. I feel kind of despairing about that.

Communicating with Amy is a bit like diving into a bucket of wallpaper paste! It's so bland and gooey. And nothing is clear. I look for some way to explain the problem to her, but there's nothing drastically wrong with her classroom teaching, not much I can really put my finger on. When I went out to observe her, she had the children's attention, she told them the content, she read them stories quite nicely. She administered and supervised the children's work. I certainly couldn't fail her: her practicum was well-organized, the cooperating teacher was happy, everyone was happy - except me.

Amy seems so involved with her own performance. Her focus is on administering work rather than on human interaction. I guess I'm finding out that my focus is more on the human interaction in teaching, but I don't know where to start with Amy. How do you say to her, "You have to be more human, you have to interact with kids"? You can't tell someone "You teach like a bucket of wallpaper paste"! It just wouldn't be productive. So I thought, "Maybe I can find something I could point out to her, something we could work on". Well, finally, I latched onto her voice as a place to start because her voice reflects that personal blandness I've mentioned. It is dull and never varies. I switch it off in three minutes. So I asked her to tape her voice and to try to get a little more dynamism into it, to really try to engage the children with her voice. At first she forgot to tape, which is a normal human reaction, but then she decided to make the tape and lo and behold, she couldn't hear anything wrong with her voice. It sounded great to her. Now usually when people listen to their voice on tape, they often feel it doesn't sound "right", that it sounds strange. But it didn't faze her at all, it sounded good. We even taped

the cooperating teacher's voice as a comparison, but Amy couldn't hear any difference in the way she gives directions. Of course, by that time , Amy was really feeling threatened and rattled. So what could I do? I eased off and thought, "There is no difference I can make". I feel as though I'm plunging into this wallpaper paste all the time. It's a kind of tunnel and there's nothing I can seem to latch on to that is going to offer us any hope of improving.

Amy is now into her last practicum placement in a beautiful kindergarten classroom that has been operating very successfully for five years. At first I thought, maybe this will help her, because there is no way that you can get away with giving directions to little kids in a dull, lifeless voice and expect them to be organized. I should have known better, because she telephoned me last night after only three days in the classroom and said "the first thing I've got to do is change the way things operate". She can't cope with the play aspect of kindergarten: to her, there's no way that play is productive, it's of no use. Amy can't cope with the idea of free movement to centers. She wants them to change centers every fifteen minutes, because she has to monitor their learning and "it's just not organized enough". She complained that there's no curriculum; she can't cope without objectives. I told her that if she wished, she could determine appropriate objectives of her own as long as she didn't expect the children to accomplish them all in one day, as long as she realizes they may never accomplish the ones she designs, but may achieve important ones of their own.

I should have realized that moving her to an environment that demanded that she change wouldn't necessarily change her. Rather than adapting to the environment, she is trying to change the environment to fit her. After the phone call, I thought, "I give up". But what did I do this morning? I sent her a little book about communicating with young children! I don't know what else to do. I don't know how to make her more self-aware. It scares me to think that she is going to be a teacher. Oh, she'll run a very correct classroom, as long as she can have her workbook for reading and her workbook for math and her workbook for language, as long as it depends on on her organizational ability to be a parking warden in the classroom, administering groups. To those who believe that that is teaching, she will do a fine job. She will be great in a behaviour modification program or in a teach by objectives program. But that is not the kind of classroom I would like to see operating. I think she's a dismal failure. I feel that in passing her, I'm contributing to the propagation of the worst parts of our school system. (reconstructed from iR-III)

Reflections:

A. Teacher Education as Struggle

Rachel honestly shares with us a difficult and discouraging experience, one that points to the many struggles we can encounter as teacher educators: struggles with others, struggles with "the system", struggles within ourselves, and struggles with failure. Struggle occurs when we encounter difficulty in our striving to fulfill our dreams, resistance in our attempts to make the ideal real to ourselves and to others, or difficulty in our efforts to understand. Struggle can only be sustained by commitment to something in which we believe, and our commitment is made manifest by our refusal to accept that which threatens our hopes and dreams. Rachel's commitments are strong and her struggles are many. We see her internally battling a student teaching rating system that seems to seek to measure the unmeasurable, forcing us to judge "acceptable" that which Rachel feels we ought not to accept. We see her struggling with Amy and with her feelings towards Amy: Rachel knows that they have failed to establish an authentic dialogue and she finds herself now struggling with that failure. And throughout all of these struggles, we sense Rachel's desire to influence specific change in the schools, to fulfill the

pedagogical hope that sustains her life as teacher educator.

We sense, also, that through these struggles, Rachel is learning about herself as teacher educator. Amy's student teaching experience not only calls into question the evaluation system but also forces Rachel to reflect on her own vision of the nature of teaching. In trying to identify what bothers her about Amy, Rachel must identify and articulate her own beliefs, wrestling with her own understanding. In reflecting on her disappointment with Amy, we sense that Rachel is searching for deeper insights into teacher education.

B. A Double Commitment: Our Students and our Pedagogical Dreams

Rachel desperately seeks a glimpse of Amy as a possible teacher; that is, as someone whom Rachel can in good conscience name "teacher". Being a teacher educator can mean commiting ourselves to helping every student become the best possible teacher that student can be. But what happens when, as in the case of Amy, the "best possible" doesn't seem to be good enough? As Rachel does, we may find ourselves caught in a dilemma, torn by the internal tensions that occur when our deepest commitments become suddenly opposing. On one hand, we feel committed to our students: to accept who they are and to help them learn within the context and limitations

of our shared reality. On the other hand, we have a passionate commitment to our pedagogical hopes and theories: that which makes our teaching possible in the first place. These commitments usually overlap or coincide; indeed, as we have seen in the other stories, it is often through our commitment to our students that we fulfill our commitment to our dreams and theories. Consequently, we usually manage to maintain both commitments with little difficulty, allowing the shifting interplay between them to shape our actions as teacher educators. How difficult it is when the shifting tensions become so stongly opposed that we are suddenly forced to choose between them. In a sense, Rachel is confronted with a choice she feels she shouldn't have to make. Where does her first commitment lie? Alternately despairing and defiant, Rachel refuses to choose. In order to hold on both to her commitment to a certain vision of teacher education and to her commitment to Amy, she remains determined to help Amy be a better teacher, making desperate gestures even though the writing on the wall seems painfully clear.

Almost against her better judgement, Rachel simply refuses to give up on Amy. To do so, could be to admit failure: failure to a student, failure in passing on one's vision of teaching, failure to deal with what is perceived as a meaningless rating system, and worst of all,

failure to oneself. Admitting failure also means at least momentarily abandoning faith in the egalitarian dream that every student can be helped, that every student can learn, a belief that seems to be characteristic of the education professoriate. An ethos of "service" and a democratic commitment to education for everyone who seeks it is a historical legacy which we inherit as teachers. Although this ethos is often lightly dismissed as sentimentality or as an excuse for mediocrity, it doesn't really go away when teachers become teacher educators. As one teacher educator put it, "My first priority in working... at the university is service to the students in my classes." (wS-II-1) We don't give up easily on our students; we often go to what other university professors might consider extraordinary lengths to help our students. This can sometimes make it difficult to make peace with the elitist tendencies that are a part of university life.

C. Images

There are many undercurrents in Rachel's story, vague but intriguing images of the possibilities of existence within our lives as teacher educators. We might, for example, catch a glimpse of teacher educator as the self-imagined knight, Don Quixote, tilting at the windmill giants of technocratic teaching. Rachel is faithful to her dreams, defending them steadfastly even though she is well

aware that many other educators view things differently. Perhaps, though, it is not against windmills but against real dangers that Rachel fights. In considering this possibility, we may view teacher educator as the hero, David, challenging with stones of truthful insight the all too real Goliath of the lifeless, suffocating mass of bureaucratic objectives that pervade and shape our educational systems. In voicing and acting on her explicit and thoughtful pedagogical beliefs, Rachel expresses a deep commitment to change, to "making a difference". She is highly critical of specific practices, and is trying to do something to change them, thus showing us too the possibilities of teacher educator as critic and teacher educator as radical.

We sense Rachel's internal struggle: she wants to accept Amy as a human being with whom authentic dialogue is possible, but as her frustration grows she understandably wishes that Amy were someone else. Thus Rachel witholds confirmation from Amy, cutting off any real possiblity of pedagogical interaction. As we shall see later in Josee's stories, as teacher educators we may often grow impatient with what is, yearning impatiently for what should be. Education students, we think, ought not to be like Amy!

In Rachel's story, we briefly glimpse the possibility of teacher educator as evangelist, "Mine is the

way! Be who I want you to be! Do what I say you must do". Rachel wants to help Amy become self-aware, but does self-awareness at times grow close to meaning seeing as we see? In conversation, Rachel at times referred to what she calls "the messianic aspect" of our lives as teacher educators. The other participants too, spoke uneasily of the possibility that underlying our encouragement of our students to think critically lies a belief that truly enlightened people will see things our way. At the same time however, there radiates throughout the interviews an eager willingness to continually question our own beliefs and a dread of unwelcome, over-zealous disciples. Like Rachel, the participants seem self-aware and very self-critical of a tendency to preach. Consciously, we seek not to coerce, but to inspire and to show through authentic dialogue and action. We ask to sing our songs, and we hope that others will find them pleasing, take up the chorus, and then go on to write their own music. When faced with failure, however, we can find ourselves selling, persuading, attempting to convert, manipulating, or even exhorting, in essence banging our head against a stone wall as we fall farther and farther away from pedagogy.

III. Stories Told by Michael

Teaching about Teaching: Setting the Example

- 1 -

During my graduate program at University..., I was given the opportunity to be a joint lecturer to a group of about 400 senior undergraduate students. My colleague and I were assisted by about ten graduate students whose main responsibility was conducting seminar sessions following our lectures to the total group. Towards the end of the term we decided to open the session to questions from the students about what we had been doing. Numerous questions were directed to the content for the purpose of clarification for understanding. But then, one older student stood up near the back of the large assembly hall. In a somewhat angry and trembling voice she blurted our this question: "You have spent considerable time showing us how not to teach; would you please tell us what a good teacher should do?" I have never forgotten the response of the class. The snickers, laughter, even applause, still ring in my ears. Even more so, I recall my own feeling of dismay. I determined at that point that I would, in future, work harder to convey not only in the content but also in the methodology what it is that I believe... about teaching.

- 2 -

A year or two later, I was teaching an introductory course which... focussed primarily on the history of education. As the first few classes went by, I noted one student in particular who made no effort to take notes, answer questions, or become involved in any class discussion. To make matters worse, he seemed disposed to provide comments under his breath for the entertainment of those adjacent to him. One day I decided to confront him. As the class progressed and he fell into his usual posture, I asked him to explain his behaviour. Quite boldly, he told me that this was the most boring, useless experience he had had. He saw no purpose to it and wondered why history of education was a necessary part of the teacher education program. At first I felt quite angry because none of us like to be told that what we're doing is literally of no consequence and tedious on top of it. Rather than give him a lengthy lecture on the subject, however, I decided to reexamine what I was doing.

In the quiet of my office, I determined to change my behaviour in a way such that he would have the answer to his question. I still believed strongly in the importance of

what I was teaching, but I realized from his comments that I had not given enough attention to my own teaching methods. It becomes easy for us to trade on our previous experience and to reassume the routine lectures we've developed in the past and continue along the same lines. I realized that I couldn't ever afford, as a teacher educator, to take the stand that everything's been worked out and it's simply a matter of going through the motions. Teaching is an act of creation. It requires our constant critical assessment or appraisal of what we're doing and why we're doing it.

Over the next several weeks, I worked harder than ever before at making sure my lessons were interesting, novel, and related to the concerns of a teacher. During that time, I observed the gradual change in this student's behaviour. The culminating experience...occurred on the examination day at the conclusion of the course. He came to me and with obvious pleasure indicated how much he had enjoyed my class. He noted that he had found the answer to the question he had raised... earlier in the term. He felt that the history of education <u>was</u> important to him as a future teacher. For me that experience captures much of what I see as central to the role of teacher educator.

- 3 -

A subsequent example is a much more recent experience teaching undergraduates. I became concerned about the objectives of my classes. Feeling that the purpose of developing critical, analytical thought was not as central to the experience as I wanted it to be, I applied for an innovative projects grant in order to prepare some curriculum materials designed explicitly to achieve these goals. I wanted to give my students materials and experiences that would encourage them to develop their capacity for critical and analytic thinking. As I used these materials with the students, noting their frustrations, their enjoyment, their sources of interest, I had numerous occasions to ask myself what I was doing as a teacher educator. I was doing more than teaching the history of education; I was teaching about teaching. My own behaviour was representing to them what they would experience in their classrooms. As students, they were receiving a first-hand experience designed to enhance their understanding of their own professional role. At the conclusion of the course, a colleague was invited to interact with my students in order to gain an objective assessment of the experience. The feedback was extremely positive and I received reinforcement for the role which I had chosen as a teacher educator. (reconstructions from iM-I-14,15 and wM-I-1,2)

Reflections:

A. Challenge, Pain, and Risk

With courage and honesty, Michael offers us a glimpse of the challenge facing professors of education and the risk we take each time we set foot in the classroom. We are reminded how central our students are to our professional lives. Not only are we expected to teach our students about teaching, we are also expected to be "good" university teachers, perhaps more so than are other professors. We are expected to set an example by "practising what we preach", by offering ourselves as models of sorts. After all, teaching is supposed to be our area of so-called expertise and the subject of both our research and our scholarship. The image of knowledge imbedded in these expectations is one of practical knowledge: knowing implies being able to act on what we know. Through action, however, we start a dialogue with others that may call our actions into question.

Michael shows us what we all know but don't dare discuss in the research literature: being a teacher educator can involve pain and humiliation. His story gives words to our secret nightmares and dreads, to the darker side of our lived experience. Who has not at some time known that horrible sinking feeling of being caught out a bore or an

incompetent, or of having in some way failed our students? Who has not privately relived those painful experiences, recalling either the stupid things we did and said or the hurtful comments our students made ? The pain we feel at such times is twofold: there is the pain of rejection that occurs when we are denied confirmation in our students' eyes, and there is the even greater pain of what we may learn about ourselves from such rejection, of being challenged to face ourselves, to see ourselves through the eyes of others, and to judge for ourselves our own actions. There are even times when others appear to judge us favourably, but we do not feel confirmed because, in our own eyes, we have fallen short of the mark.

Confronting our teaching as it is means confronting the difference between the ideal and the real, between our hopes and our actions, between who we wish we were and who we really are. That is where the pain lies. In order to avoid that pain, we may sometimes avoid confronting ourselves, leaving it up to others to do so. Fortunately, the pain which seems so inevitable a part of our teaching experience also has a bright side. As Michael illustrates, if we do not run away from it, it can help us learn and grow. We learn about teaching from the challenge of teaching itself. Confronted with a painful personal experience, Michael accepted it; he met it as a challenge head on, serious in his

determination to learn. In a sense, he was questioned by life, and he accepted the responsibility of answering through action.

> We needed to stop asking about the meaning of life, and instead to think of ourselves as those who were being questioned by life.... Our answer must consist, not in talk and meditation, but in right action and in right conduct. Life ultimately means taking the responsibility to find the right answer to its problems and to fulfill the tasks which it constantly sets for each individual.... Questions about the meaning of life can never be answered by sweeping statements. "Life" does not mean something vague, but something very real and concrete, just as life's tasks are also very real and concrete. (Victor Frankl: 1963, p.122)

Answering the challenges and questions in life involves risk. Marcel (1978) asserts that we can do nothing else except take that risk:

> Experience teaches us...that we can never refuse to take risks except in appearance, or rather that the refusal itself conceals a risk which is the most serious of all, and that it is even possible for us finally to condemn ourselves in this way to lose the best of the very thing by our avoidance we had intended to safeguard. (Marcel,1978:55)

B. Commitment to Teaching

Because of student dissatisfaction, Michael sees reason for concern. As his teaching becomes more and more a personal and a professional priority, Michael turns to his practice, giving it attention, thought, and action. Through an internal dialogue between the ideal and the actual, he confronts himself and is able to see new possibilities as a

teacher educator. He then acts on this new understanding. In so doing, he eventually finds a deep sense of confirmation both in his own eyes and in the eyes of his students. He feels that he succeeds in narrowing the gap between the "is" of his teaching and the "ought". Through action he shows his commitment to teaching and to the hope that it is possible to improve one's teaching. He believes in himself as a teacher educator, and he believes in his own power to change. He grows closer to what he feels his professional calling to be:

> Each of us has need of the personal confirmation that can come only when we know our "calling".... We need to feel that our work is "true" - both as a genuine expression of the reality that we encounter in our lives and as a genuine response to some situation or need that calls us. (Friedman: 1983, p.55)

As Michael illustrates, our identity as teacher educators is strengthened through the confirmation we find in thoughtful practice. Through encounter, reflective action, and risk-taking, the personal meaning we accord to being a teacher educator becomes clearer. This meaning and purpose seems to be centered on teaching; more specifically, on the sort of teaching that is intimately related to our students' learning. We seem to want every student to gain something, to find something meaningful in our teaching, to grow. As was the case for Ilana and Rachel, the learning to which Michael wishes to address his teaching involves more than fact consumption or information processing. It involves

seeing the world in a new way.

C. Learning about Teaching

Michael spoke of many incidents both as a young child and as a university student that strongly influenced his teaching practice and his ideals. As a student, for example, he was impressed when teachers of large classes could call him by name early in the academic year, and he was "motivated" when he felt teachers took an interest in him as a person, even if that interest was in the form of a challenge to "do better". These personal experiences have became incorporated into Michael's views of what teaching ought to be. Through our personal experiences as learners and teachers we continually refine and deepen our pedagogical understanding. Although there is, of course, a certain danger in assuming that "what's good for me is good for others", we all expect to a large extent, that understanding our own experience helps us understand that of others.

Michael also questions his knowledge of teaching in the light of his lived experience as teacher educator:

> I've never been able to appreciate the comments of those who say, "Well, you need to go back to the classroom, you need to spend more time out there in the elementary schools" or what have you. I've never understood, because what the teacher in the schools ought to be doing is the same thing that I ought to be doing here, and that is trying to find

> out more about the teaching act. As I engage in it here, it's as real to me as if I was doing it out in the field.... If I could convey what teaching is to my students through the way I relate to them, I hope that they would be able to take that into whatever environment or context they go into and have the key to their success of being a better teacher. (iM-I-28,29)

Michael seems to be suggesting that, whether we are teaching children or young adults, the nature of pedagogy remains the same. If we are self-aware and self-critical, university teaching provides us with at least some of the first-hand teaching experience we need in order to learn more about the nature of pedagogy. Teaching emerges as a mode of learning for the teacher educator.

With Michael, we have begun to explore new aspects of our experience as teacher educators while also reconfirming some of the ideas we first encountered with Ilana and Rachel. Like Rachel, Michael has reminded us that our experience is not always joyous and pure, and like Ilana, he has underlined the importance of giving our deepest care to our university teaching.

In the next stories by Josee, we shall find further insight to the complexity and paradox of our lives as teacher educators.

IV. Stories Told By Josee

The Play: Of Jewels and Ashes

Last night I was flying high. I worked with a group of adolescents (we put on a play) and was graced with an island of success and happiness in a sea of frustration. These kids were shining in their newness. For me they embodied hope and life, and as I watched my play, I felt that for once I had created something beautiful. The play was a small shining jewel, so perfect, so full of hope and life and potential. The kids had worked their butts off for me. They gave me their all. I'm very demanding. I tell them, "I want you to lift your hand like that, I want you to say your line this way". They've been screamed at when they didn't get it right, but there is the love of it too. They were fully aware that I worked terribly hard to help them look good. They knew I cared and that I helped them for the pleasure of it. I had kids coming up to me and saying, "I think I'm going to make a career of drama". I've shown them what classical theatre is. Watching the performances, I thought, "This is what it's all about". I was proud of myself because I had been allowed to create and I was proud of them because they were beautiful children, so alive.

When do adolescents stop trying, stop growing, and become the fossilized young adults whom I teach? This morning it all turned to ashes as I looked at my university students. These prospective teachers... see life as one big conformity to existing standards. They have so little spiritual life, so little capacity to create. These future teachers seem so lifeless, so opinionated, so callous, so unaware, so empty. Yet a few years ago they were probably just like the adolescents in the play last night. And these are the people who will tell me that my ideas about adolescents are unrealistic! You can't tell me that you can't motivate adolescents to do things. It's just not true. What you have to do is to make them fall in love with the stage and show them what it is and make them explore it, and then they will be willing to work twenty-five hours a day to do something that is meaningful. I think all human beings are like that. I know that I have found a small particle of the truth, at least I have found my truth, but I so often feel that I can not even share it with my education students. They do not want to hear it. I feel like running away, back to kids. At least they are alive and willing to learn. When do adolescents die!? And who kills them!? Maybe I should go back to theatre. I need to create something beautiful. How shall I ever stay alive?

Oh, well, I may just be tired. I must remember to also see hope in small things. And I guess, as stupid as it may sound, as long as I am here, things are not all wrong. I can and do make a difference. I must. I need to hold on to that more that I need to breathe. The play was just an ego booster, a reminder that I can do, I can create, I can make a difference. (a reconstruction based on wJ-I-1,2 and iJ-III-11,12)

Reflections:

A. Confrontation and Disillusionment: Renewing Conviction; Playing the Game

Josee finds that working with children reaffirms her pedagogical beliefs, giving new conviction to her university teaching. It redeems her in her own eyes for having spoken contrary to the beliefs of her students. During the interviews, Ted, too, spoke of renewal of conviction in the face of criticism from teachers and education students. The beauty of the ideal, of what we imagine or hope may sometimes contrast sharply with the views of those who do not share our visions. The disillusionment that this may involve tests the plausibilty of our theories and dreams and tests our ability to speak what we believe. The resistance to our pedagogical theories that we encounter among students, colleagues, and teachers impels us to continually renew our thought by turning yet again to our lived experience for confirmation.

But, as we saw in Rachel's second story and in Michael's stories, there is sometimes pain in confronting the

gap between what we wish and what we see, and we are not always brave enough to acknowledge that gap or make the confrontation. We hear in Josee's lamenting about her students, a momentary abandonment of hope. At first, rather than accept responsibility for that loss of hope, Josee recites a litany of the faults of today's students, briefly playing what Eric Berne (1964) might call the "Ain't it awful" game, a conversation ritual in which people find collegiality and consolation in describing how terrible things are, blaming others, and thereby avoiding the necessity of confronting their own actions. If the faculty lounges of the universities I have visited or worked in are any indication, this game seems to be a widespread pastime among professors of education. I know I have indulged in it on many occasions and was never at a loss for fellow players. How we long to teach classrooms full of bright, enthusiastic, talented young pedagogues who assume resposibility for their own learning and engage us in stimulating dialogue!

Like Michael, however, Josee is too interested in learning and too committed to hope, to play the game for long. In the following excerpt from her diary, Josee gives us another example of how hope and despair are intertwined and of how much we learn when life (others) confronts us.

Learning from the Good and the Bad

By Josee

Today I tried something new in class: an unrehearsed, dialogue with a colleague (a philospher) in front of the students followed by a class discussion. Before coming to the university this morning, I was so scared about all of this that I was a grouch with my family. I told my students that I was trying something new and that I was nervous. I think because of that they tried all the harder. They seemed really interested in our conversation and after class many of them told me that I should repeat the experience next year.

Today is a good day because I have a feeling that I opened doors for people both this morning and in my afternoon class. That is what I really enjoy. I exhausted myself, but my heart is glad and I feel full, I even feel "high". I guess this compensates for yesterday's blow to my pride when I learned that one group of students really slaughtered me in their evaluation. But I consciously took the decision that I will <u>not</u> seek revenge. I feel that I did all that I could with those students,... but maybe I did get lost a bit and I did not accept them unconditionally. I was very disappointed in some of them because they were called to be "big" and decided to stay "little". I guess I didn't know how to call them to surpass themselves. In that sense they are right to criticise me. I have failed them and myself because I became too concerned with me, with <u>my</u> survival, <u>my</u> message, and <u>my</u> aspirations to meet them in <u>theirs</u>. Will I ever learn? The power that I have lies in my capacity to nurture and this I lost track of, I think. (wJ-II-1,2)

Three themes of great importance are imbedded in this diary entry: how we call and are called by our students; the dialogical nature of the pedagogical relationship we ought to have with them; and, the nature of the call we issue to them.

Josee suggests that the pedagogical relationship

demands that we find a way to call on our students to become the best they can be: "My job", she said on one occasion, "is to wake them up to themselves. I can't do anything else." Josee writes of the joy of opening doors for her students, and of the call she makes to them to grow, to be "big". I can't help thinking here of the suicide note left by Lily in John Irving's novel, Hotel New Hampshire . It offered as an explanation for suicide, "Not big enough". Josee's deeply felt need to create illustrates that it is not only our students but also the teacher who must grow bigger. Life calls on us to grow, to expand what Maxine Greene calls our landscapes of learning (Greene:1978).

Josee mentions two occasions when she felt she had "called" on her students. In the first, when she calls on them to be "present" to her dialogue with a colleague, they accept her call. In the second, when she calls on them to be "big", they confront her through their written evaluations with a different call of their own. The dialogical nature of the pedagogical relationship lived by teacher educators becomes clearer. We call or confront our students with who we are and what we know, and are in turn confronted by who they are and what they know. Out of the confrontation, everyone ends up having to face themselves. Although tempted to dismiss the students' criticisms, Josee instead, as Michael does, sees it as a call to learn about herself as

teacher educator. She is understandably disappointed when her students choose to walk away from her call to be "big", but she also realizes that abandoning them would only make matters worse. Josee is too self-aware and too committed to the pedagogical relationship to walk away from it. Perhaps the secret of truly being a teacher educator lies, as Josee suggests, in knowing how to call our students. That is the difficult question we strive to answer in our daily practice. To the extent that either party avoids the other's call or confrontation, we fall away from pedagogy, we lose a chance to learn or to teach. As Josee so perceptively points out, when we hear only ourselves and not our students, we fail as educators. There is no dialogue. That's when we become preachers, not teachers. Similarly, if our students never learn to confront us, they risk remaining apprentices rather than knowers. When they abandon questioning or interacting, they are no longer learners.

In telling her stories, Josee awakens us to important aspects of our lived experience. Her story points, as the other stories have, to the dialogical nature of our pedagogical relationships. As Michael and Rachel have done, Josee illustrates the pain, and the difficulties and the responsibilities we encounter in trying to call our students. But as Ilana and Rachel do, Josee also reminds us of the joy, the confirmation, and the renewed hope we can find in being

pedagogically with children and in working creatively to make a difference. Her story reflects the power of our lives with children to redeem or renew our lives as teacher educators.

The next story by Serena deepens our understanding of all the other stories by exploring further the importance of growth or learning to our lives as teacher educators.

V. Stories Told by Serena

An Alternative to Collecting Milk Money

Three or four weeks ago, I had a meeting with one of my graduate students. It's ridiculous staying in my office, because the phone keeps ringing and you can't have a decent discussion. So we went to the faculty lounge and we sat there. Laura was doing some really exciting work. Even at the master's level, she was really pushing back the boundaries. She was trying to formulate a philosophy of working with children, trying to incorporate some new ideas. It was very stimulating. And so we sat there and discussd at a very professional level and I can remember thinking on the way back to my office, "My gosh! This is what I really think we are about here!" We're here to look for better ways of doing things, more insightful ways to understand children and to understand the people who work and interact with children.

I guess I ran into my Chairman at that point and I shared how excited I was about this whole thing. It really made me feel good. I was doing the sort of thing that I probably should be doing more of. And yet, when I think of most days, it seems you spend so much of your time answering phone calls, filling out forms, and doing routine tasks that seem so mundane. Teachers often say when they're collecting milk money in the schools that they wonder why they needed a four year university education to collect milk money. Well, sometimes I spend a whole day here and it feels like I've been collecting milk money all day. I guess that's what makes this work with Laura really an exciting, challenging experience. I felt that I was helping Laura clarify in her own mind what she was reaching for and I just felt really good about it. She had been drawing together some ideas from anthropology, sociology, and linguistics and was trying to apply them to education. That's what we should be doing more of, exploring new ideas, and questioning things that are taken for granted in our field, questioning the way things are done and finding better ways if necessary. I guess I felt that I was getting as much out of it as Laura was. We were helping each other clarify the meaning of her new ideas. We both were really pushing hard, trying to come to a new understanding of what it is that makes some situations work with teachers and children and others not. It was like an opportunity to sit down with a colleague and share ideas and both grow. I think this is what teacher education should be about.

I wish there was more time for things like that. We seem to get bogged down in more mundane things. I know the mundane things are important too, but I guess I feel that graduate studies should be full of the kind of experience I had with Laura. I guess I began to see the excitement of working with graduate students. Usually when you're working with undergraduates, you're helping them discover and uncover lots of things that perhaps are old hat to you. This can be exciting too and is valid for sure, but...
(reconstructed from aural recording, iS-IV)

Reflections:

A. The Need to Grow: Pushing Back the Boundaries

The excitement and joy in Serena's work with Laura underlines her deeply felt need to grow, a desire for the challenge and stimulation of an authentic interchange of new ideas that forces us to "push back the boundaries" of our understanding. There is longing in Serena's voice as she expresses her regret that her daily life as professor of education does not permit more frequent exchanges of this quality. But as she speaks of the meeting with Laura that is so special, there is a joy in her voice that is highly remniscent of the way Ilana and Rachel told their stories. Once again, we hear clearly the joy of personal learning. Serena's experience offers further confirmation of the power of learning in our lives as teacher educators to lift us above the mundane. Our belief in this power sustains our deep commitment to learning, although, as Serena indicates, the organization of university life may sometimes make that

commitment hard to fulfill.

In writing a description (scenario) of how he wishes university life as a teacher educator could be, another professor speaks for Serena and for many of us, saying:

> What I really like about my work at the university is the expectation that I am to be a scholar, a professor, someone who is interested because being interested is the essence as well as the energy of education....It is therefore gratifying that the exploration of fundamental interests in education is not only personally exciting, it also provides the setting in which the mandated task of teacher preparation can be pursued with the foremost insight that is possible for us to create. Participation in the creation of such insight is the joy and significance of being a member of this department.... We teach, but we teach with a vigor and confidence springing from the hope that the excitement of our personal exploration of pedagogy will reveal glimpses of what it can mean to be truly educated. When is the last time we have asked ourselves, personally, what it means to be educated? If we don't pursue questions like this (and embody the answers in our professional lives) who will? (wS-I-1,2)

We see in this excerpt, that Serena is not the only teacher educator who finds joy and excitement in the prospect of pushing back the boundaries.

As both teachers and learners, teacher educators remain faithful to the promise of deeper understanding or as Michael put it, to a "belief in the central part of learning to one's existence, ...the belief that knowledge ultimately will make you free" (iM-III-8). Although we individually

might attribute quite different meanings to the word "free", those different meanings come together at least partially in their reference to what we perceive as the state of existence that enlightenment makes possible for humankind. Michael's use of the word "free" reflects the belief that a wider range of possibilities for action and a broader context for interpretation of the world is made available through learning and that this in turn enlightens human decision, human action, and human understanding. Michael believes that through the freedom made possible by understanding, we exercise an enlightened choice, thereby gaining greater control over our existence. Through the freedom born of understanding, Josee believes we learn to be responsible to life, and Rachel and Serena suggest we can make the world a better place for teachers and children. As teachers, teacher educators, and scholars, we pin our hopes for the world and for ourselves on the power of learning to emancipate.

B. The Hermeneutic Circle of Teaching and Learning

Serena's encounter with Laura is so very satisfying because it helps both of them move forward in their search for deeper pedagogical understanding. Perhaps this joint search is the heart of our ultimate mission as teacher educators. As Serena says, "Maybe that's what it's all about". Through teacher education we act upon our commitment

to teaching and to learning. Indeed, for teacher educators, teaching and learning are best seen as overlapping aspects of the same whole, or as the inextricably interwoven threads of the fabric of our professional lives. The joy and challenge of learning quickly becomes the joy and challenge of shared learning; it becomes teaching. Through the joy and challenge of teaching, we learn more about the world and more about teaching. As teacher educators, we are called both to learn and teach about teaching and to teach and learn about learning. We may find, as Josee, Michael, and Serena do, that we are often doing both at once.

As in the hermeneutic circle (Palmer: 1969), there is in pedagogy a neverending interchange that continually renews the meaning we find in teaching and learning. The pedagogical relationship between teacher and student mirrors this dialogical interaction. Serena is pleased that she is able to help Laura clarify her thoughts, but her satisfaction does not stop there. To Serena's utter delight, Laura also teaches her, challenging her to push back the boundaries, becoming in Serena's words, like a colleague. As we saw earlier in Rachel's story of "Brown bear, brown bear", it is when teacher and student have travelled through dialogical interaction once around the circle, that we grow as close as we ever may to fulfilling our pedagogical mission. The student is no longer only student, nor the teacher only

teacher.

It Can Happen

by Serena

One of the most exciting things that happened this year is a special evening course that I taught with a colleague. We went around and talked to people in different schools and told them that we would like to work with a group of teachers who wanted to make some changes in their own classrooms. We didn't have a set agenda or course outline, that would have to come from them, but we wanted to help facilitate whatever change they wanted. Anyway, we explained all that and people registered for the course. But when they came to the first class, they sort of sat there and looked very glum and asked us, "Well, how many papers? What do you expect from us? What sort of marking system?" and so on. We told them that we really didn't have a lot of expectations except that they identify something that is really important for them to work on in their classrooms, maybe something that might help each of them move closer to what they see as an ideal teacher or their ideal classroom. "Once we know what it is that you want to do", we said, "then hopefully we can help you work towards that". Well, we left that first class wondering if anyone would come back and having a really funny feeling that this was going to be awful. We were sort of hoping they would all drop the course and then we wouldn't have to worry about it!

Well, the next week they all came back plus two more who had heard about the course from the others! We were trying to get clusters of teachers from the schools because anytime you are trying to make some change or move into a new area, we feel that it's really important that there be some support system. If you can get two or more teachers in the same school working towards the same end, we have found in previous experiences that that can be very supportive . So we ended up with clusters of two or more teachers in several schools and that was very good.

Great things started happening. For example, we started holding our classes out in the schools so that we could share experiences in the context in which they occurred. The third time we met, we visited a school where two grade two teachers had identified what they wanted to do;

that is, to develop some learning centers for the children. We got out to their classrooms just two weeks after they had started and they had each already set up sixteen learning centers! Now this was the sort of thing we would never have asked anyone to do. We probably would have said, "Maybe you want to start with one center and see how it goes and then in a few weeks, maybe add a second one". They had turned their whole day into a learning center experience and were super enthusiastic about it. It was going very well and they said they were more excited about teaching than they had ever been before.

Well, their enthusiasm just got the whole class going. Each week we went to a different school and the teachers shared with us the things they were trying to do. People made suggestions and gave feedback and we brought in information that was pertinent to what people were doing. I think the whole class began to find we really had a support group going. It was as though a lot of them were ready to try new things and it just needed a tipping of the pendulum to get them to jump off and try. It was just like the story of the baby birds who were sitting on the edge of the windowsill. The mother bird said to them,"Fly! Fly!" and they said,"No". Then the mother bird again said, "Fly!" but the baby birds still said, "No". And then the mother insisted, "Come on! Fly!" and finally, they flew. They soared up to great heights. It was almost that thing for some of these people.

It just took a little nudge and then they were doing really wonderful things. They were attending to children's individual needs and getting them to take more responsibility for their learning. They were becoming freer with children. For example, at first, the second grade teachers I mentioned grouped the children into pairs and made them do certain centers each day. By the next time we visited, they had decided that the students could pick their own partners and could select the centers that they really wanted to do. The teachers were putting more faith in the children and I think the children responded very positively. This sort of thing was happening in many of the classrooms. It was exciting to see all this transpiring in a matter of months. And then at our last class, they all asked if we could continue next year so that they could go on and fine tune and refine their ideas and really get things perfect. They want to look at ways we might share their ideas with other teachers through writing and workshops. Right now we're at the stage where a committee from that group is going to get a proposal together for some funding for another year.

We hope these teachers will eventually get involved

with our student teaching program as cooperating teachers. Then we will have some classrooms where we can send our students to see some of the things we talk about at the university. We'll really feel good about sending our students out to these teachers because we kmow the sort of input they'll be getting.

This experience gave me a chance to be in the schools and see some exciting things happen. I think as a teacher educator it's so easy to somehow forget the realities of the classroom. I know students often say to us, "Well, you don't know what it is really like out there. What you're telling us here sounds great, but it won't really work out there". So having the experience of working with teachers and seeing them making it happen reassures me. These teachers have to cope with parents and principals and curriculum guides, and all the rest, but it still works, it <u>can</u> happen. I know it can work because I saw it happen. I need that because I don't want to be only theoretical and abstract and "ivory tower". I want what I share with students to be something that will really work and be good for them and good for their children.

<u>Reflections:</u>

Serena's second story reaffirms many of the themes which we have been exploring thus far. As in Rachel's and Ilana's stories, we see the desire to generate, to contribute to pedagogical practice in the schools, and to touch the lives of children. We see also the search for confirmation of pedagogical theory. As Josee and Rachel did before her, Serena shows us the delight and deep sense of confirmation she feels when it is demonstrated that her dreams can indeed come true, that what she imagines <u>is</u> real. The successful practice of her students reaffirms Serena's beliefs, lending new spring and confidence to her teaching. The interdependence of theory and practice, of understanding and

lived experience, is underlined for us once more.

A. The Pedagogical Relationship

Serena's story also illustrates something I have only briefly hinted at so far: the elusive nature of the pedagogical relationship between teacher educator and student, that essential something, that elusive quality of being that Rachel said does not appear in rating scales, but that does appear in some of the special moments described in so many of these stories. These are the times when the participants feel they are-- and I think they *are* -- truly pedagogues: Ilana's reading of the poem, Rachel's sharing with Tara, Michael's interaction with his students as they use the new materials he made for them, Josee's class discussion, and Serena's work with the teachers. What makes these joyous moments of successful pedagogy possible? What is it that is so eminently satisfying and beautiful about them? What is really happening?

Those moments when we feel most like teachers are often those times when we manage through encounter to naturally point a way to our most cherised dreams, without preaching. The glum teachers at the beginning of Serena's story were expecting a deaf preacher who would tell them what to do. Because they didn't expect Serena's teaching to

really touch their practice, they didn't really look to their professors as true teachers. Initially, they witheld their confirmation. To their delight and surprise, however, they found two professors who turned authentically and hopefully to their students as trusted partners in dialogue, hearing what they had to say, concerned with the reality of their lived experience. A meaningful "between" was thus created.

Those moments when we feel most like teachers don't seem to happen through any specific technique; it has more to do with the way we are with our students and they with us, in our being together pedagogically. During such moments, our students make us truly present, we are confirmed as teachers and are thus hopeful enough to share, to contribute, to point a way. During such moments, we are not self-conscious, but are totally involved and carried away by the compelling possibilities of pedagogical dialogue. As the dialogue progresses, we come to see ourselves and the world in new ways, and we come to a deeper understanding. Through pedagogical encounter, both teacher and student grow, learn, generate, confirm, and are confirmed. Is it any wonder that in becoming truly teachers and learners we find such deep joy and satisfaction ?

My collection of stories was to end here. But when I shared my collection with Michael (as I did with all the

participants), he pointed out that something was missing, that one important aspect of being a teacher educator was not, he thought, sufficiently illustrated. As an opportunity to explore that missing dimension, I offer a last story, reconstructed from my own journal entries.

VI. A Story by Sandra

It Went Very Well

Once or twice a year, I usually present a formal paper at a conference. I don't know what makes me send in those abstracts! You'd think I'd know by now how nervous I get, and how there is never enough time to prepare adequately. The conferences always seem to fall just when I have a pile of exams and papers to correct. But I guess I keep doing it because I know it's the only way to force myself to get something done. By promising to have a paper ready, I know I'll just jolly well have to find the time.

Despite all the complaining I do, I enjoy doing the research that leads up to the paper, and I actually enjoy writing and rewriting and polishing a paper, struggling with ideas, ordering my thoughts, and thinking things through. For me, putting my thoughts into words is a way of discovery, a way of finding out what I know and also what I don't know. It is a pathway to greater clarity. But as the time to present my ideas to a large audience of respected scholars draws near, my paper begins to sprout all kinds of inconsistencies and faults that I hadn't noticed. The paper no longer seems finished; there are so many glaring questions that I did not address. I repolish the paper, eventually feeling a renewed kind of satisfaction with it, enjoying its flow of words, and feeling that "It's not too bad after all, it rings true". Until, after rereading it, I begin to realize how banal what I have to say seems to be. I see with despair the looming walls of the boundaries of my limited vision and ability. What can I possibly say that they don't already know?

I practice reading it, promising myself that if nothing else, I won't be one of those who reads in a monotone at my colleagues, head down, ignoring their presence. I promise myself I will be brave enough to leave time for questions at the end of my paper. I will not cram only my words into the time we have, I will leave time for theirs. I really do want to know their reactions, but I am also frightened to learn what they think. What if they show me to be even more ignorant that I already know I am? What if my paper is of no use or relevance to anyone but myself? But, my paper in not irrelevant. I do believe it is of value and import. Why do I get so nervous? Why do I always get myself into these situations? How I hate this!

During the conference, I am far too stimulated and excited by the sessions I attend to remember to be nervous, but when the time to present my paper finally arrives, the nervousness and fear rush in. I wish I could be somewhere else, anywhere else! But then I start to read, and the sound of my own voice and the familiar words of my paper calm me down. I relax, look up, and find myself diverging from my text to take into account new thoughts that occur to me even as I speak, thoughts relating my paper to my audience and to the conference. Eye contact is made and the audience seems attentive and responsive. Clear sailing all the way! And then come the questions, and I find, to my astonishment, that I actually enjoy the questions, that they are stimulating and helpful. Until the one that is thrown aggressively at me like a poison-tipped spear. The speaker is hostile, and I think, unfair, but somehow that too is a part of this whole paper presenting ritual. I somehow survive the question, finding something to say that perhaps does not satisfy the questioner but that at least silences him. I approach him after the session to try to better understand his real question, but we don't seem to speak the same language at all and he is not really interested in dialogue. I feel dismissed but don't take it too badly, still basking in the warm reception accorded me by so many. It is over. Later that day when friends who did not attend ask how it went, I smile and sincerely reply, "It went very well".

The unfortunate part, I guess some would say, is that I never get around to reworking and submitting those papers for publication. I do distribute copies to people that request them, and I use one of those papers in my own teaching. But it's as if once I've learned what I learn in writing the paper and have had the feedback from presenting it, then other matters and other questions seem more pressing. The piles of work that I put aside to prepare the paper reclaim my attention. My studies and teaching commitments call loudly. The tedious and unpleasant task of editing and submitting an article fades away. I know I had better get around to it some day, but it doesn't seem all that important right now.

Reflections:

In reflecting on this story, we find that much of what is true of teaching also holds for research and the formal presentation of scholarship. Like teaching, writing and presenting emerge as a mode of learning, as a way of sharing what we have learned, and as the search for confirmation in our professional identity. Through language, and more specifically through the writing and speaking that structures our teaching and presenting, we learn what we know and we discover new understanding. In this we experience joy and deep satisfaction. There is an aesthetic dimension in thoughtful speaking and writing. We glimpse the possibility of creating something that sort of "hangs together as a whole", taking on a form of its own. But in struggling to find the "right" words and sometimes failing, we also glimpse as Serena did, the hazy boundaries of what we don't know, hearing a faint call to explore further. In this we find both frustration and a challenge. In sensing our limitations, we may momentarily despair, but our commitment to the eternal possibility of deeper understanding helps us overcome that despair, faithful in our hope that what we can not see today, we shall perhaps more clearly see tomorrow. The challenge is acknowledged and a promise is made to meet it some day.

Part of what makes preparing a paper or writing an article different from our daily university teaching is the audience to whom we are addressing ourselves, the people with whom we wish to share our discoveries. In the encounter between professor and student, the power of knowing may confer on the professor a mutually acknowledged position as leader or guide. Through encounters with students, we find confirmation as teacher educators. Although we learn from our students and, although our students can be excellent judges of the value of our knowing, they offer us a confirmation that is somewhat different from the confirmation we seek from colleagues. In our colleagues, we encounter people whom we acknowledge in advance to have equal or greater power as knowers. Through formal dialogue with them, we seek formal confirmation as knowers, as scholars, and as pioneers of knowledge. Hence the fears and self-doubt but also the exciting sense of conscious risk-taking we hear in my story.

In committing and revealing ourselves publicly, we seek official membership in the community of scholars. But in my reluctance to actually submit an article for publication, we sense an ambivalence about how important confirmation as scholar really is to our lives as teacher educators. We also sense, of course, a possible fear of rejection, or possibly even fear of success! The part of the

whole endeavour that is most meaningful and engaging for me is the discovery part, finding new ways to view things and to say things. Writing an abstract is almost like sketching in advance the hazy outline of a new territory to be explored; it is an imagining of what is not yet known, and is thus an important step towards that knowing. I think that is what keeps me coming back for more, why I keep sending in those abstracts.

CHAPTER FIVE BEING A TEACHER EDUCATOR: FURTHER REFLECTIONS

The stories have been told and some of their themes explored. The power and meaning of the stories may grow and shift as we and other readers encounter them again in different times and places in our lives. Each re-reading may expand and deepen their relevance to our daily practice.

The research questions that guided this study ask what it is to be a teacher educator and what images of teacher education emerge from the lifeworld of teacher educators. The stories in the previous section are probably the best answer I can offer to those questions. I wish, however, to share in the remaining chapters some further reflections that grow out of those stories and out of the interviewing; reflections that expand some of the themes introduced by the stories and that offer us a critical view of our lives; reflections that incorporate some of the political, cultural, and social aspects of teacher education as we live it in North America today. These reflections call upon and reveal even more of the participants' experience. Ted, who has not yet appeared in the stories, will have a strong voice here.

I. Pointing the Way: Cultural Generativity

The stories and dialogues presented in this study provide excellent examples of teacher education as "generativity" (Erikson: 1963). In a recent book entitled Outliving the self, Kotre (1985) explores Erikson's concept of generativity in relation to life histories or stories, speaking of generativity as "a desire to invest one's substance in forms of life and work that will outlive the self"(p.10). Kotre describes two kinds of generativity that relate directly to teaching:

> Technical generativity is accomplished by teachers at all stations of the journey through life who pass on skills to those less advanced than themselves....Here the object of legacy-making is the apprentice, with whom the instructor identifies as a way of reliving past experiences of mastery and extending those experiences into the future....But the object of generativity is not merely the apprentice, it is also the skill itself, whose life is vicariously the possessor's: this craft shall be kept alive and its potential developed. Often there is conflict between the welfare of the apprentice and that of the skill. One instructor declares that the skill has priority: if the pupil cannot fully master the art in question, cannot perform the right way, he will have to be dismissed. Another instructor favors the pupil: recognizing the limit of students, he compromises technique and teaches only what is in their capacity to learn. The tension between the two receptacles of technical generativity dissappears only when a follower comes who can fully command technique and carry it to new heights. (p. 13)

> Cultural generativity is directly concerned with the mind. When a teacher turns from how to do it to what it means, when she speaks of the idea of music or healing or law, when she brings to the fore the symbol system that stood in the background and offers her student the outlines of an identity, she becomes culturally generative. She is

> no longer a teacher of skills but a mentor, and her apprentice has become a disciple.... By culture I mean no more than an integrated set of symbols interpreting existence and giving a sense of meaning and place to members of a perduring collectivity. (p.14) ... What the mentor must do is offer an engaging vision of who the disciple might become, a vision that is true both to the disciple's and the culture's potentials.

Housego (1982), after Benne (1970), views education as a process of personal and cultural growth and renewal.

> The ideal type of influence relationship between teacher and student, according to Benne, is anthropological authority . This concept connotes more than transmission of culture by the enculturated: it means as well..."mutual renewal and reconstruction of persons--in cultures." (Benne in Housego,1982:400)

Benne's concept of cultural growth and renewal (rather than simple replication or transmission) conveys some of what Kotre means by cultural generativity, underlining the importance of Kotre's use of the word "potential". Mentors, as Kotre suggests, must be true to the potential of both disciple and culture. We see in Michael's, Rachel's, and Josee's stories how difficult and painful this double commitment can be. But we also see in these stories how strong and necessary this commitment seems to be. By truly attending to who our students are (what Buber calls "making the other present"), we are able to offer them a vision or a way that authentically takes them into account, a vision that is true both to who they might really become and to our own

pedagogical hope. Ilana's recognition of the poem as "fitting" her students, Michael's ability to modify his teaching to engage his students, Serena's desire to start with the concerns of her students--all these are examples of being true to our "disciples" while at the same time remaining true to our theories and dreams, to our "culture".

To the extent that teacher educators are truly mentors, we are committed to nurturing and fulfilling the potential of our pedagogical culture. We are committed, not to rigid duplication of our favorite teaching methods (for that would be technical generativity only), but to making schools "better". There will always be promising possibilities that we have not yet imagined. Our hope is that through our teaching, our students will be able to recognize the potential we ourselves may not see--and may not live to see. While we wish to preserve and pass on our dreams, we also wish to encourage action that, while true to these dreams, may expand or change them. In this manner we make our contribution, leaving something of ourselves behind and lighting a spark that might change the future. Thus we give purpose and meaning to our own lives. This generative striving to make the potential some day possible reflects and maintains the hope on which rests our commitment to teacher

education.

Teacher education can thus be viewed as cultural generativity. By individually and collectively finding deep meaning and importance in certain ways of viewing pedagogy, we emerge from the many encounters of our personal history and experience as faithful "keepers of meaning" (Kotre: 1984). Our pedagogical dreams and theories are a legacy which we nurture and care for, offering them with hope to future teachers as possibilities of existence. Perhaps that is wherein our conservatism lies. Like guardians of a sacred flame, we pass on in our inspired discourse the Torch of Dewey (or Whitehead, Comenius, Pestolozzi, or whomever) and hope the fire will catch. But, as we have seen in some of the stories, we often find it doesn't. Hence the great delight and significance for us, when, like Ilana, Rachel, Josee, Michael, or Serena, we experience a moment when it seems we did make a qualitative, practical difference in the life of a teacher or child. As both Serena and Rachel pointed out, these are the moments that make it all worthwhile, that give meaning to our lives as teacher educators, and that help us endure and even find occasional meaning in the endless committee meetings, telephone calls, and routine tasks of our daily existence.

Perhaps not all professors of education are as clearly committed to teacher education as a primary way of giving meaning to one's life through cultural generativity. In their concern for passing on technical skills or information, some may limit themselves to technical generativity only. To the extent that we do so limit ourselves, we are content to be instructors rather than educators. Indeed, there is a large body of literature that does advocate teacher education as coaching and instruction (see, for example, the extensive work of Bruce Joyce), but it is cultural rather than technical generativity that seems central to the professional lives of the participants in this study.

II. Touching The Lives Of Children : a matter of biography

Where does the desire to touch the lives of our students and children come from? The desire seems to grow out of personal biography. Michael, for example, spoke at length of how deeply he had been impressed by the personal interest certain of his teachers and professors had shown in him. He was delighted to have the world of learning and scholarship opened to him in an inspiring manner that nourished and supported him through difficult times. Now he wishes to see other teachers pass on to their students what he was grateful to receive as a student. His vision of what

teaching should be is deeply affected by his own personal experience, by his interpretative encounters with the world. Although philosophers and researchers supply Michael with some of the appropriate terminology and the rationale for his beliefs, the heart of these beliefs grew from lived experience. Through our own personal lived history, we reconstitute our world, searching for confirmation and meaning in our lives as teacher educators. This confirmation and meaning in turn shapes and is shaped by our generative striving.

As a further illustration, Ted's desire to touch the lives of teachers and children is firmly based on his experience as teacher, administrator, and graduate student. Ted feels that sometimes he short-changed his students in his early days as an elementary teacher, for example, by treating art as a "penny subject", something to keep the children busy on Friday afternoons. Through dialogue with a respected professor and through contact with critical scholarship, he eventually came to view his own teacher preparation as having had "holes large enough to drive a truck through" (iT-I-5). He wants to spare tomorrow's teachers some of the mistakes of yesterday's; he wants tomorrow's children to have more pedagogical opportunity. In a sense, helping other children indirectly through teacher education redeems his past

experience as a teacher. The mistakes of the past help inform our dreams for the future.

In a similar fashion, I could describe how the personal history of each participant gave shape to his or her pedagogical desire and hope as a teacher educator. We can desire change only when we can imagine things in a different way, that is, only as we learn. The desire for change in the schools is thus an expression of our personal learning. In reflecting critically on our pedagogical past, we try to see what was good about it, what was bad, what was missing. We search for meaning and direction and hope.

III. Making A Difference : Teacher Educator as Radical or Conservative?

Ask almost any teacher educator why it is important to be a teacher educator, what the ultimate goal is, and without any hesitation the same response will be given in almost the same words, somewhat like a Hippocratic oath that has been learned by heart. And yet the answer is not "pat". It is spoken with authenticity and commitment.

> Rachel: I thought for a long time that by going into teacher education I might be able to make some difference, however minor, to a group of teachers who are going out into the school system. (iR-I-3)

Ted: I think my major concern is to try to give children better classroom experiences, to get rid of some of the workbook kind of syndrome, the paper blizzard out there, and... to try to give kids more meaningful activities. (iT-I-6)... When I stand in front of a class of student teachers I really sort of see twenty-five or thirty kids behind each one. Then I think that instead of teaching thirty students, I'm really teaching nine hundred kids and that makes a lot of difference. It is a serious kind of job. (iT-III-7)

Ilana: I really still go on hoping that in some way what I do with my students here at the university might someday help them improve the quality of education in our schools... we still need stars to reach for. (iI-I-5)

Michael: If we were less concerned about graduating students who would know how to fit into the system and more concerned about graduating people who could really think critically about a situation, who were creative and imaginative, we might find... that we begin to have an effect on what goes on out there in the schools. (iM-III-5)

Like many of us, the participants want to "make a difference" (Rachel) and this difference seems to be one of influencing change towards "good practice" (Ted) or "mind activity" (Michael). What is the nature of their expressed desire for change? Is there an element of the revolutionary, of the subversive in this desire?

Rachel: I've seen tremendous need for change in elementary education. And you do one of two things; either you work by example... or you work by revolution. There seem to be two ways: political or educational. This society is in no way ready for revolution and neither am I. I think I would prefer to infiltrate, to change from within. Being a teacher educator is my way, at the moment. (iR-I-9)

The participants spoke with passion and conviction. At least on the surface, their desire seems

sincere and strong. What is this felt need for change? What is lacking in the schools? What specific influence do we want to have? Each of us has our own private vision:

> Michael wants to see that sort of teaching which would lead to more "mind activity" in the schools. He feels classroom activities and interaction should incorporate a critical inquiry model of learning and teaching. Michael wants teachers to be remembered not only for their kindness, but more importantly, for the love of a subject or the love of learning that they spark in their students. He views the ultimate goal of learning as enlightened control over one's existence.
>
> Josee, as we have seen, would like to see students and teachers become more aware of themselves and of the world, becoming what Maxine Greene (1978) would call "wide-awake". Inspired by Alfred North Whitehead, Josee would like to see them become responsable, that is, able to respond truly to the challenge of living through a cycle of liberty, discipline, liberty. Josee talks of the importance of making knowledge relevant and of integrating the academic subjects. "When you learn about a tree", she says, " you should look at it not only from the point of view of biology, but also from the stance of the artist, the poet, the wood carver, the forestry industry, the farmer, and most importantly, the child. This does not happen often in the schools" (iJ-III-7).
>
> Serina believes strongly in children's natural desire to explore and to learn through doing. She would like to see the schools offer much more opportunity for active learning through the manipulation of concrete material and through social interaction. She would like to see teachers base their programs and activities on the child's real interests and needs, giving the child more autonomy. She thinks teachers underestimate children's abilities and do not take the "whole" child into consideration, do not make learning meaningful to the child.
>
> Ted would like to get rid of the unthinking and routine use of worksheets and workbooks in the schools. He also speaks often of breaking down walls between the various academic disciplines, like Serena and Josee, hoping teachers will integrate the academic

> subjects to make learning more meaningful to the child's world. He would like teachers to ask themselves why they are initiating any given activity, to be more self-critical, to strive towards "good practice". He would like teachers to take children more seriously and to give them more responsibility.

Calls for change and their implicit criticisms of the schools are probably almost as old as teacher education itself (see, for example, Alan Carr: 1962). And, yet, teaching is often considered to be a conserving activity (Postman: 1982). It is seen as the way society perpetuates itself, the way one generation preserves its beliefs and culture and passes it on to the next (Apple: 1979; Giroux: 1981). Most research (see, for example, Sirotnik: 1983 or Goodlad: 1984) suggests that despite all the money, legislation, new curricula, buildings, equipment, implementation programs, continuing education, and calls for change, what goes on in North American schools has not changed much since the beginning of the century. In most classrooms in most schools, a teacher still stands in front of the class with students writing silently at their desks. "Rhetoric about what <u>should be</u> undoubtedly shifts more rapidly and strongly than either the beliefs or practices of teachers". (Goodlad:p.174)

Are teacher educators really radicals, as our earnest rhetoric sometimes suggests, or are we "closet"

conservatives, working as Bartholomew (1976) suggests, to maintain the status quo? Are we both? Do our actions contradict our words, conveying a hidden curriculum of traditional practice? Has our critical barking been rightly perceived as impotent blustering that can be tolerated by the system we criticize because our own lack of action implies we can be easily ignored? Perhaps with justification (Lortie: 1975), we blame the lack of fundamental change in the schools on the socialization process in the schools, or on our students, or even on our own teaching (Zeichner & Tabachnick: 1983), but the question remains: is our desire for change authentic or is it merely an impressive camouflage behind which we hide from ourselves our own ineptness, inactivity, or lack of generativity? As teacher education moved into the university setting, teacher-educators have become university professors. We are becoming socialized into the role of professor. Maybe this socialization, too, can in some ways be an obstacle to being an agent or a model of pedagogical change for the schools. However, as both the research literature and the participants' frequent critical comments make clear, nothing seems to stop us from criticizing! As Joyce and Clift (1984) remark, "the field is not just surrounded by critics, it is inhabited by them." (p.5)

Perhaps criticizing what <u>is</u> enables us to

imagine what ought to be. Our frequent calls for change are, in a sense, our way of reminding ourselves and others of just what our hopes or ultimate goals are, of just why we strive to be generative. In this we are often radical dreamers, filled with the hope and images of wonderful possibilities. Is it too easy to feel we have done our job merely by keeping a dream alive? Or is that in a sense our mission? Is it the power of our dreams rather than the example of our action that we wish to pass on to future generations of teachers? Perhaps it is impossible to do one without the other; for as we saw in Ilana, Michael, and Serena's stories, it is only through action that we can truly communicate the power of our dreams. We find meaning in our lives through the active pursuit of our dreams, in making the imagined real. The essence of our generativity does not lie in a false dichotomy between theory (dreams, hopes) and practice, but rather in how we live.

In comparing "dreaming" (theorizing) with action (practice), Josee made some interesting comments:

> You don't learn anything unless you go out and try it. Otherwise you live only in a world of dreams. I think you've got to have...a harmony...between being a dreamer and being a person who does .... I think that action in a real life situation, when you really understand a life situation, when you really work and care about it, becomes very painful...I think pain makes you sit at attention....We misunderstand this whole thing about pain in learning. I think reality or life

> as we lead it is very violent. I see idealism or theory as being more soft, more easy to live because when you idealize something, when you dream about something, it seems always possible. You never fail, you never fall on your nose... It is action that is often painful... but you learn from it. (iJ-III-1)

Perhaps it is our fear of pain or our lack of understanding of pain that prevents us at times from more vigourously and actively realizing our dreams.

None of the participants believes that he or she reaches every student or that he or she has had major impact on the schools. But that does not stop them from striving to make a difference. Ted, for example, put it this way:

> I'd like to speed up the process of change, but I think realistically it takes time....Rome wasn't built in a day and education is not going to change significantly in a day either, in fact I would even suggest that...in terms of some of the significant things I am hoping for, there won"t any changes for another hundred years....You can change the furniture around but it doesn't do anything for the house....You'll find, for example, that all of the magazines are full of little innovative ways of getting kids to remember better or something, but are still not hitting the main question in education. What is it all about? (iT-V-9)

As we saw throughout the stories, moments of true generativity and confirmation are savoured as something special that must give off enough warmth to last until the next time. As the passing years of our careers permit us to face more truly the gap between the hoped for and the actual, we begin to place our hopes within an appropriate historical

and political context, realizing that we must sometimes invest our hope and action in smaller steps or in different things. More secure in our professional confirmation, we may fear the pain of action a little less and accept our human limitations a little more. Perhaps it is enough to do what one <u>can</u> do. But if our commitment is to remain strong, there must be enough in our doing to maintain the hope on which our commitment is based. In seeking what we can do, we must therefore continue to ask what we ought to do. We are never finished with dialectics.

Returning to the question that heads this section, perhaps we can answer that teacher educators are radical <u>and</u> conservative. We are radical in the changes we seek, in our hope to fulfill our pedagogical dreams, to make a difference. But we are also conservative: hoping to pass on the best of what was and what is; hoping to preserve that which we see has within it a potential for a future good. It is thus in our hope that we are both radical and conservative:

> Might we not say that hope always implies the superlogical connection between a return and something completely new? Following from this it is to be wondered whether preservation or restoration, on the one hand, and revolution or renewal on the other, are not the two movements, the two abstractly dissociated aspects of one and the same unity, which dwells in hope and is beyond the reach of all our faculties of reasoning or of conceptual formulation. This

> aspiration can be approximately expressed in the simple but contradictory words: as before, but differently and better that before . Here we...come once again upon the theme of liberation, for it is never a simple return to the status quo, a simple return to our being; it is that and much more, and even the contrary of that: an undreamed-of-promotion, a transfiguration. (Marcel: 1978, p.67)

Marcel's comments speak eloquently to Kotre's work on generativity, deepening our understanding of our generative striving, opening the possibility of generativity as transformation or liberation.

IV. Children and our Pedagogical Hope

In Josee's story of the play she directed with children and in Rachel's story of "Brown Bear, Brown Bear" we glimpsed the power of our lives with children to redeem and renew our lives as teacher educators. Many of the participants expressed the need to be with children, the need to be reminded once more of the focus of our childless university activity:

> Ted: I find that sometimes when I become disenchanted...with teacher education, going back and working with kids restores my faith....There's something about children, their innocence and yet there's a certain survivability sort of thing about a lot of kids that... does me some good. I'm not saying all kids are wonderful and I'm not romantic about kids....Often when I get discouraged it's because people...say our ideas are idealistic or they don't work, or they won't work, or who's got time for them, or what ever the reasons they give. Now, I find that when you go and try some of these things,

that they do work. That you <u>can</u> give children resposibility. So I find that kids restore in me some faith in what we're trying to do.... they're a breath of fresh air sometimes. (iT-I-35,37,38)

<u>Serena:</u> Basically, I hope to help people work more effectively with young children. I think it's really my feeling toward young children and children in school. (They) are such precious things and are...curious and so alive and so full of wonderment. And I guess it saddens me to see them get turned off sometimes at school....And so, really, what I'm trying (to do)...is to make it better for little kids in school so that they don't lose this fascination. It used to be there naturally, you know. (iS-II-1)

<u>Ilana:</u> When I visit the schools to supervise student teachers, I realize how much I miss teaching children. They can be so spontaneous...enthusiastic, and generous of themselves. It's so wonderful, just watching them, I learn so much .... but I hate to see what happens to them in so many classrooms, to see their autonomy, their curiosity, and their creativity squelched without mercy....I realize they can and do survive a lot...but somehow it makes my work at the university seem more important than ever. We must and can make things better for children. Children give me hope; working with future teachers does too... sometimes I lose sight of that in the day to day scramble of committee meetings etc.(iI-II-3)

How similar is the way the participants speak of children, the schools, and the purpose of their own work! How important the well-being of children seems to their sense of professional mission. Josee and Serina use the expression "so alive" to describe children; Ilana and Ted are grateful for children's "survivability". Marcel (1978) asks if "I place my hope in you" is not really the most authentic form of "I hope". We seem at times to identify children with life itself, or at least, with all that is hopeful in continuing

life. Throughout the interviews there echoes a pedagogical hope for the future of children and a deep commitment to making that future possible. This hope is rooted in our lived experience of children. Ilana's reading of the poem, Rachel's observation of a student teacher, and Josee's direct work with children are all examples of those special moments when we suddenly remember, when we understand again why we became teachers in the first place. We remember the faith we have in children to become. We remember the joy of teaching and of helping or seeing children learn. The curiosity, the natural desire of children to learn, calls to the pedagogue in us. Through being with children, through our efforts to know who they are and who they can be, we see possibilities of a pedagogical relationship with children that inspire us, inviting or reconfirming our commitment to indirectly touch their lives through working with teachers.

Sometimes it is the horror we feel at what is that fuels our commitment to what ought to be; sometimes it is the delight in what is that gives impetus to our commitment to preserve what is. We wish to conserve that which is faithful to our dreams and to change that which is not. In authentically being with children, we sometimes remember what it is that we wish schools could be and what it is we have to offer our own education students. Through the

potential we see in children, our hope surges and our pedagogical beliefs grow stronger. We are confirmed in our calling and we come to know just why we wish to be generative and what it is that we wish to pass on. Our commitment to teacher education is renewed and the meaning of our lives as teacher educators seems much clearer.

CHAPTER SIX OUR LIVES AS PROFESSORS OF EDUCATION

Historically, at least, being a teacher educator and being a university professor are not exactly the same thing; for the most part, teacher education has only recently moved into university faculties of education. Although the participants speak of being a teacher educator and being a university professor as much the same thing, they also reveal some ambivalence and difficulties that seem to relate to living the two titles at once. This chapter reveals this dimension of our lives as problematic, amplifying some of the undertones of the stories and interviews, and questioning many aspects of our lived experience as professors of education.

I. Teacher Educator as Professor

A. The Offer: The Initial Challenge

When I asked the participants to tell me how they had become teacher educators, they all talked about becoming university professors; that was what seems to have left an indelible impression.

Ilana: To my surprise, and I think also initially to my consternation, the university offered me a full-time position. I didn't know what to do. I had really decided to work only part-time, but here was this unexpected job offer that was just too exciting to pass up....the challenge of something new, of teaching at the university level, the chance to work in the stimulating environment of a university. I guess I also felt kind of flattered by the offer and yet annoyed at the same time, because I knew it would be hard to turn down.(iI-I-5)

Serena: Maybe I thought it was kind of an honor to be asked to teach at the university.... It wasn't the salary, I can tell you. (iS-I-11,12,13)

Michael: I was offered the opportunity to teach [at the university]....I was excited. I'd never dreamed of teaching university. I guess I viewed the university as being a really select environment. I thought of the people who taught there and who had taught me and I couldn't have anyway put myself in their league. When the opportunity did come, it was just unbelievable. I can remember telling one of my principals. I was so excited about this [offer] and I thought he would be too, but he was quite negative about it and discouraged me from taking it. Finally, I decided I wanted to give it a try anyway.(iM-I-6,7)

For many of us, becoming a university-based teacher educator is the unexpected, the unintended, even the seemingly impossible. The offer of a position as professor of education often catches us by surprise, revealing that few of us initially look upon ourselves as possible professors. Accepting the offer may be experienced by some people as a casual matter of trying something out, as taking the only available option, as choosing the economically or socially expedient, or as making the obvious next move in a career.

But why, when the offer comes, is it so often experienced as something exciting, as an "honour"? Does it not at some level awaken unnamed yearnings, offering us a glimpse of that which, as Michael suggests, we have seldom dared to dream we could be? An offer is the future interrupting our present with a vision, however hazy, of who we might be or what we might do. All at once, it makes the seemingly impossible perhaps possible. To those of us who accept the offer, it is often like answering a call that is only vaguely understood but whose importance to our lives is somehow felt.

In accepting a position that officially labels us "professor of education", we are invited to seek a personal meaning within that title. That meaning may initially have more to do with the idea, challenge, or honour of becoming a university professor than with a well-defined sense of mission or deep sense of what it means to be a teacher educator:

Michael: When you're offered the job you say to yourself, "Well, what is it that I have to offer?" Part of it is to try to fit yourself into that image [university professor] and most of us, I suspect, can see ourselves as coming up short with regard to that. But then when you start to get into the trenches and try to deliver yourself, then it is of significance and import. You really come down to what are the basic things in which you believe. (iM-I-19)

I guess my most basic thoughts were ones related...to what I thought a professor ought to be able to represent. I saw [a professor] as some one who is

reallly knowledgable, experienced, expert. I can remember myself thinking of some of the professors who had taught me as the most learned and articulate people that I've ever encountered. I was really in awe of them as a student and even as a colleague initially....being a part of the [university] environment was basic to my concept of teacher educator. Being in that environment...required somebody who has studied a great deal and knew a lot about teaching, about education, about children, about society, and who on the basis of that knowledge could help prepare somebody to go out and perform successfully in the classroom. It was never the how-to-do-it kind of thing. (iM-I-16,17)

Serena: I found it quite frustrating when I first started at the university. I went in and lectured for fifty minutes and then left and didn't really interact a lot with students. And that seemed to be characteristic of a lot of university courses at that time....I was initially preoccupied with living up to this image of what I thought a professor was...you know, even in acting and looking like a professor... but all that has changed. The more I found myself interacting with students and sharing ideas with them, and getting them to think about ideas,...the more I found it much more exciting and interesting to work in that area [teacher education]. (iS-I-7,8)

Ilana: I remember feeling proud and scared all at once. I really couldn't see myself as a professor; I thought I looked too young and I didn't see myself as erudite.... I remember going out and buying a new briefcase and also spending a fortune on books, thinking that now I could indulge myself in these things that I had wanted for a long time but hadn't been able to justify spending the money on...I also recall working like a slave until two or three in the morning to prepare my first lectures. I felt I really had to impress my students with my knowledge, I had to have something to offer them, and I really had better be very well organized... I had to be up to the challenge...of course my concept of professor of education has turned around almost 360 degrees since those days. (iI-I-9,10)

We can sense the unease and uncertainty that the participants first experienced in struggling to come to terms with this new title, "professor of education". We hear the vague

yet persistent challenge they issue to themselves to "measure up". Maurice Friedman (1983) provides some thoughtful reflections concerning our initial search for meaning within our new professional titles:

> Each one of us must risk himself to establish himself as the person that he or she is and risk failure in so doing. Paradoxically, this means that while the "calling" in its original meaning is an answer to a call, we have to take the first step ourselves and assert that we are called before the call comes. Each of us, no matter how thorough our training, experiences a moment of uneasy tension between our personal and professional self when we first step forward as a "doctor", a "minister", a "teacher", a "lawyer", or even a "husband", a "wife", a "father", or a "mother". At this moment the question "What am I doing taking on this role?" may well produce an invisible inner panic that has nothing to do with competence or "self-confidence". This is the sense of incongruity that comes when one part of ourselves is consciously "role-playing" while another part looks on and asks whether we can, in all good faith, identify ourselves with this role. If we can make this venture "stick", then we shall be confirmed by others in our "calling" and soon will come to identify ourselves so much with our social role that our self-image will be unthinkable without it. (p.57)

In the beginning, it appears that the identity that initially claims us as we claim it is that of university professor. For many of us, it is only after dealing with the name "professor" that we can turn our attention to our identity as "teacher educator". For those of us who began as teacher educators outside of faculties of education, however, the experience might be quite different.

We shall continue our exploration of some of the

ambivalence and tensions we can experience between our role as teacher educators and our role as professors, by uncovering some of our views towards research.

B. Formal Research: A Selfish Waste of Time?

The overwhelming demand on our time that is made by the complexity of university life forces teacher educators to set priorities. The interviews suggest that teaching and other pedagogical concerns are the most important aspects of our professional identity as teacher educators, that teaching rather than formal research determines the way we set our priorities in lived time. Although, as in other disciplines, the "proper" or "official" view of the profesor's role in education holds formal research as vital and central to our purpose, the pervading unspoken attitude among many professors of education is quite different. Indeed, if "research" refers only to that activity which leads to formal publications, then it sometimes seems to be (secretly) considered as selfish, something done by those who are more interested in advancing up a career ladder than in truly learning themselves or in truly educating their students.

Serena:

> I have really wanted to write an article this term.... but I haven't managed to do that. It's not that I don't feel it's important, but rather that it's more

"for me" than for anyone else.... Teaching remains my priority....I feel better if I am doing things that are helping my students....If I said I'm going to teach this course or I'm going to meet with these students to talk about the program, then I feel a real responsibility to be there... and if I'm going to do it, I want to do it well. The writing seems more of a personal thing....if I don't get the article done, I mean who's going to pay for that except me, because then it won't be on my resume? It's not doing me any good if I don't write it, but then it's not doing anyone except myself harm. (iS-III-12, 13, 14)

Ilana:

Although no one will admit it around here, you get dirty looks if you take too much time to do a research project or stay at home to write articles. It's considered selfish, time away from course preparation and from the students, teachers, and programs that really need us.... We all know that only a very few people will read the esoteric stuff we manage to get published in those expensive, small-circulation journals....If we were really interested in sharing and expanding our knowledge, perhaps we'd do more workshops and inservice or write for the less prestigious but more widely read magazines. We'd be more involved in politics and government committees or we'd read more. We'd give seminars to our colleagues (they never read our articles) and organize discussion forums. Surely these are just as important ways to truly meet our obligation to disseminate and advance knowledge.... But of course, it doesn't count for much in the eyes of our university colleagues in other departments and faculties. So officially we say formal research is important, but actually, we are sometimes resentful or jealous of colleagues who find the time to do it. I feel quite frustrated by this because I like doing research; it's hard to find a balance. Everytime I schedule a half-day for writing, something urgent comes up and I feel guilty if I don't re-schedule the research to make room for whatever the emergency is. How do you say "No, I am working on an article" to a student who asks for help, or to the Chairman who convenes an emergency meeting, or to a colleague who needs to discuss something important and has no other free time? There is too much to be done by too few. (iI-II-12,13)

Many of the participants suggest that although formal research and publishing are potentially valuable, they are neither necessary nor sufficient to the being of teacher educator. Rather, they seem to be perceived more as a part of the role of professor. The participants' view of research and its relationship to publishing has been expressed in the literature by Mooney (1975):

> A man doesn't have to publish to do research; he can communicate the shape of his experience in a lot of ways, and often the best way is right on the job with those with whom he associates daily. Publication may help to put one in touch with a wider range of people who are interested in sharing in the way one likes to share; it is helpful to have that company, but it is not the measure of whether or not a person is doing research.(p.200)

Instead of viewing research as something that must be formal and that must lead to publication, most of the participants view research as a lived process of systematic observation and reflection, almost synonymous with learning and teaching. Josee, for example, speaks of her university teaching as "my research". If one views them both as systematic learning or discovery, research and teaching can be said to overlap. Most of the participants' support such a view, calling into question the conventional dichotomy between "teaching" and "research" seen by the university community.

For Michael, however, as for some professors of

education, part of our highest duty is precisely to do formal research, to "advance the frontiers of knowledge" publicly, and to share our learning within the community of researchers. I have already recounted how Michael felt that something was missing in the original collection of stories about our lives as teacher educators because there was no story dealing with formal research or with preparing a paper for presentation. But the very fact that formal research activity did not emerge in the original stories is perhaps in itself indicative of what being a teacher educator does not mean to most of the participants.

However, it does not seem to be a matter of teaching versus all forms of research. It does not really boil down to those who do research versus those who don't. Most teacher educators would affirm that active inquiry is essential to their being. Many are curious, thoughtful thinkers who do share their discoveries in some way. Where we may differ from each other seems to be in the way we cope with the shifting tensions of our dual commitment to teaching and to our own learning. Where we may differ from one another is in our view of how we ought to learn, what to do about what we learn, what to call research, and how to share our new understanding. Having just heard Ilana's derogatory evaluation of journal publications, for example, we can

imagine how easily heated discussions could be provoked in staff lounges (between Ilana and Michael, for example), turning research into an issue bringing values into conflict.

The participants thus expose the dilemma faced by all cultures when confronting the difference between the "smart" and the "proper" in different segments of the society. There is once more a suggestion of ambivalence and tension within the role of professor of education. University-based teacher educators interested in career advancement must publish a lot ("smart" and "proper" in the eyes of most of the university community) but in so doing, they may risk, as Ilana and Serena suggest, the unspoken censure of many of their education colleagues (among whom formal research is often "proper" but not "smart"). Education professors like Michael who want to publish because it is a natural extension of their learning, a challenge to be met, may also risk being thought "selfish", lacking in commitment to their students, by their colleagues (yet "smart" by the rest of the university community).

The priority many of us give to teaching over research is perhaps a reflection of the unspoken ethos of "service" to our students that seems to be firmly ingrained

in so many teacher educators, especially in women. This ethos is perhaps a natural heritage from the historical interpretation of the calling of "teacher". Commitment to service seems more easily voiced by my female colleagues, although, as we saw with both Michael and Ted, this commitment is by no means limited to women. In addition to many other social and political factors, such as how power is shared and how it is witheld in our society, the scarcity of female professors in the higher ranks of the university might reflect their historically stronger commitment to teaching, to nurturing and caring, and to other pedagogical concerns rather than to career advancement. Perhaps, again for reasons ingrained in our culture and history, some of their male counterparts have less difficulty or misgivings in distancing themselves from their students, less difficulty and resistance in saying "No", and less difficulty finding confirmation and acceptance in the politics and scholarly activities of university life.

Most of the participants seem to feel that for all the rhetoric to the contrary, the university community does not yet seem to value, as much as formal research, the kinds of informal research and service commitments made by many teacher educators. As I have already suggested, education professors who remain true to the ethos of service by

spending most of their time on matters of pedagogy while neglecting formal research (especially publication) risk censure by the rest of the university community. They seem able to take this risk repeatedly, however, perhaps because in so doing they find confirmation in the eyes of their students and close colleagues and in their own eyes. Perhaps teacher educators would want to devote more time to formal research if they came to see it as another form of "service", if they came to see it as central to being a teacher educator. If personal experience reveals formal research as meaningful in the long run to students and to the educational community, if our immediate colleagues confirm us as researchers, and if structural changes in the workplace could enable us to take time for research without having to feel that we are neglecting or shortchanging our students (in other words, without having to abandon the service ethos), then, and perhaps only then, teacher educators would increase their formal research activities. A passive resistance to doing a lot of formal research is perhaps one manifestation of the education professoriate's criticism of those aspects of university life that are perceived as undermining or contradicting that which seems essential to our calling as teacher educators.

Thus, there are faint but persistent suggestions that

"professor of education" and "teacher educator" are not always synonymous. As university-based teacher educators, we are called to come to terms with both titles, carving out an existence that permits us to feel at home in both, concentrating on those areas where the two modes of being coincide. As we saw in the previous chapter, being a teacher educator seems to involve living within the shifting tensions of our dual commitment to our students and to the growth of our own understanding (culture).

C. The Education Professoriate: Different from Other University Professors?

At a workshop I attended many years ago on improving university teaching, several professors from other faculties firmly declared that their teaching responsibility is limited to lecturing. "It is up to the students to learn," they said, "they can take or leave whatever we present". There were many comments suggesting that the relationship between their lectures and a student's learning or desire to learn is of little importance or concern. The focus in teaching was on the content, not very much on the learner. The image of teaching that dominated the discussion was one of "delivering a product". While some people there were concerned with the "marketing" of the product and with making it palatable to

the student, few expressed the kinds of concerns that so preoccupy the participants in my study; few emphasized the process of teaching or the people they were teaching; few seemed to view the knower as related to the known.

The participants in this study expressed dissatisfaction with the formal lecture style usually associated with university teaching and all of them had experimented with informal styles that solicit their students' active involvement.

Serena: "I can't consider teaching without considering learning, because why teach if the people you're teaching aren't learning something?... I prefer an interactive model to a lecture model... because the more you interact with the people you're working with, the better idea you really have of whether or not they are learning.... Tests are no replacement for interaction". (iS-IV-7,8)

Ilana: I now think that in many circumstances, formal lectures are an irresponsible way of teaching at the university, or rather, of avoiding teaching. (iI-I-10)

The other participants, too, expressed similar views, echoing the words of Phenix (1964) who writes:

> Before the invention of the printing press and other devices for making symbolic materials available there were economic and technical reasons for the traditional lecture-hall. But not now. I cannot in good conscience merely lecture to my classes and expect them to copy or annotate what I say. If I simply want to transmit ideas to them, I should write out what I have to say and let them read it, or make a tape available to them if they want it delivered orally.(p.23)

Thus although to some professors, faculties, and administrators, lecturing may seem central to university teaching, it does not seem essential to being a teacher educator; in fact, at times it might even be an example of what teacher education is not. Once again we glimpse the possibility of conflict between certain aspects of the role of professor and what it truly means to be a teacher educator. Perhaps, however, it is not truly being a professor that poses a problem, but rather our perceptions of how that role is too often lived. As Palmer (1983) writes, "The true professor is not one who controls facts and theories and techniques. The true professor is one who affirms". (p.13) In keeping with the original intent of the title, perhaps a professor, like a teacher educator, is--or ought to be--a teacher.

Of course, not all professors of education are deeply concerned about their students, nor are all other university professors disinterested in their students' learning. Perhaps there are some professors from other faculties who devote more care and thought to their teaching than do some professors of education. There may still, however, be general differences in the way we perceive and live our roles as professor, differences that I have already suggested relate to what it means to truly be a teacher

educator. One way in which teacher educators may differ from other university professors lies in the central part that teaching plays as the object of our academic discipline and courses. Another way, as we have seen in Michael's story for example, lies in the way we further our learning through our university teaching, perhaps making it a more important part of our informal research than do most. Furthermore, there may be general differences of viewpoint in considering what university teaching, learning, and research ought to be. Finally, the central importance of teaching to our identity as professors may also distinguish the education professoriate from many other university colleagues. In this sense, we are perhaps more often faithful to the original meaning of "professor".

II. The Time of our Lives as Professors of Education

> Perhaps [time] is so close to us that we cannot see it. As the late Professor Quillen often reflected, "If fish were social scientists, the last thing they would discover would be water." That which is the closest is the farthest away, and nothing is closer to us than time: in fact, man is time. (Troutner: 1974, p.159)

Woven almost invisibly throughout the interviews is a quietly persistent concern for time and a sense of time as both problematic and pervasive to our experience. Because our experience of time is so often invisible (Merleau-Ponty: 1962) or taken for granted, reflecting on how we live time

might throw a critical light on our experience as teacher educators by revealing some of the ways that the culturally embedded experience of time colours and shapes our lives. In examining excerpts from some of the interviews, we shall see how we speak of time, how we interpret time, how ambivalent we are about it, and the challenge it presents to us.

A. Time and the Quantification of Work

> Ted: If I stopped and thought about [the list of all the things I have to do], it would drive me nuts. I try to pick it off a bit at a time. It's funny this term, I'm actually teaching one course less than last term and yet I seem to be busier (iT-IV-1).
>
> Serena: It is very easy for work to become one's total life.... My husband tells me that I used to work over here until midnight sometimes and he wondered if he had married a real person or just a figment of his imagination. It took me a little while to get it all sorted out, too. I haven't gotten it quite perfect. (iS-II-19)

The participants struck me as such busy people. Nowhere did I see the image of an unhurried scholar, enjoying a loosely structured day of work that could lead where it might. A brief glance through my own appointment book reveals that I who am so astounded by the overwhelming activity or busy-ness of my colleagues am just as occupied, lining up appointments back to back, cutting up my life into little blocks of time that are carefully planned and ordered to accomplish many specific things. I derive such satisfaction from crossing things off my list, quantifying so

simply my lived experience. But what dismay I sometimes feel when I can not find an appropriate time slot for the many new things I want to write into my little book, even as I cross one item off. Often, I then do what perhaps many of us do: I use up the little slots that were initially reserved for time with family or time for exercise or other interests and commitments, or for sustenance. The participants spoke with frustration of time as a constraint on action, a limiting factor on the amount of work they could accomplish. There are so many things we feel we <u>have</u> to do, and so many others that we simply <u>want</u> to do, as if we must taste all of life. Why does the amount of work seem so important to us? Ilana echoes the words and feelings of many of us when she says:

Ilana: I could work 24 hours a day and still not accomplish half of the things that I think I should be doing, that the schools think I should be doing, or that the university administration says that I should be doing. I like to do things well, but by the time I've dealt with the routine tasks of getting stuff to photocopying, writing up a student evaluation or committee report, and returning phone calls, discussing administrative details with a colleague who stops me in the hall, and then answering a student's question, there's just no time left to get to the other things I really would like to do and have the luxury of having time to do them well. I can't possibly prepare four new courses, properly teach six courses, carry a heavy administrative load, supervise students in the schools, conduct research, write articles, do community work, give workshops, answer the phone and attend to routine tasks, counsel students, attend meetings, and have time to think and read and explore new areas all at once. Yet that seems to be the expectation in faculties of education. Our

> load (especially our teaching load) is very heavy. If the Dean tells me he wants something on his desk tomorrow, then I am the type of person who will drop whatever else I am doing to take care of that. But then somebody else sends a memo also asking for something right away, and I find myself doing things others want me to do....Now, it's not that their requests aren't legitimate or important, it's just that I would like some time for my own writing and to prepare some really fine course material. I always thought that a university professor...was someone who could sit in a book lined office and think and write, at least one or two days a week. Maybe in other faculties, but I'm lucky if I can spend one day a year doing that. It's not that I'm not an organized or efficient person. The more you get done, the more there is to do. The only way I can get any real work done is by staying home to work. But then people say you're not working and kid you about the life of leisure you live! (iI-II-28)

B. Whose Time? Whose Work?: Valuing Worktime

We see how a long list of "have to's" dictates and shapes Ilana's experience of time. Many of the "have to's" are part of the institutionalized structure of our role as professor, the dictates of an increasingly production-oriented management and technical ethos; many others are the "have to's" of our own ambitions and of our professional intentions as educators. We are forever finding new things we feel should be done. For some of us more than for others, the two kinds of "have to's " overlap. But

always, they seem too many. I sensed in many of the participants a yearning for a different way of living time, a dream of doing meaningful things very well without having to sacrifice more time than there is, a yearning to rid ourselves of the mundane routine tasks of which we heard Serena so often speak in her stories.

> Ted: I think that if we really thought about a lot of the stuff that keeps us busy, we wouldn't do it at all. A lot of it is pretty routine. It takes time, though, and we think it's important. One of the things that has been taking a lot of my time this week, for example, is that I mentioned to my second year students that in order to get to know kids better, they probably should be volunteer aides in a school or should do something with kids. It's ended up by my making phone calls to schools to make the contacts for quite a number of students, when in actual fact they probably could do it just as well themselves. (iT-IV-1)

Ted makes an important point here: in our rush to get things done perhaps we don't take the time to examine their worth or value. Neither do we distinguish between taking time, being given time, and simply having or being time. As Ilana's lament seems to suggest, if we wait for time to be given to us, we may have to wait a lifetime, living our lives through the structure of someone else's plans for our time, our time no longer really our own. It is difficult for some of us to take time (which is in a sense making time). Even though we may be the ones who fill in the little agenda books, we might find (if we had the time!) that

we are not very wide awake to the possibilities of time, not really at home in our own time. If we were more aware of time in the Heideggerian (1962) sense of primordial existential time, we could choose whether or not to freely give of our time rather than realizing after the fact that we have either lost our time or have had it stolen. Truly facing time forces us to choose, to be wide awake to ourselves and the world of which we are a part, and to know what is important to us. Among other things, this may often mean letting go of or at least setting aside one dream in order to increase the possibility of fulfilling another. But dreams are so very difficult to give up. It means facing our limitations as human beings and living just one life at a time.

Taking time also means being willing to risk confrontation if the way we wish to live our time does not "fit" external demands or expectations. Perhaps we are sometimes reluctant to examine closely our actions and our priorities, fearing that they may be quite different from those of our colleagues or those of our institutions. We may not wish to risk losing the confirmation which is so essential to our professional identity.

Ted: It takes quite a bit of time, but if anyone asks for help...I try to give it as good a shot as I possibly

> can... Last Friday, for example, I learned through a student teacher that the cooperating teacher felt she had a problem with a split three/four social studies program, so I drove out about thirty miles to take her some materials which I thought might help her. I don't mind doing that. If I don't have time, I'll tell them I don't... but I think it could become overwhelming. (iT-I-31)

Helping students and teachers is often a very high priority for many teacher educators. Nearly a whole day taken to go out to help a teacher who is not a university student, who has not even asked for help, might seem wasteful to some. This kind of living of time does not easily lend itself to an efficiency accounting. But how do we come to allow ourselves to judge how others use their time without understanding how they really live that time? It is Ted and the teacher and perhaps also the children in that class who really know the value of Ted's lived time.

C. Chosen Time, Controlled Time: Lived Priorities

> Serena: Every class is a deadline and I feel that I have to be really well prepared. I have to have papers marked if I said I'd have them back, no matter how long it takes me to mark them [e.g. staying up until four in the morning]. So those things then take priority over some of the other things which are sort of my own personal deadlines [writing articles, for example].... My own personal agenda never gets tended to.... The longer I've been here the more I've come to say, "It's up to you. Don't let those other things get in the way"....[for example], I feel it's important to spend time with students if they have questions after class. So although my class technically comes to an end at 3:30 p.m. and that's exactly when our faculty council meetings start, it is often 4 o'clock before I feel I can get there.... So I

> guess I've come to sort things out, you don't have time for everything or you're in a bad mess. You have to drop some things... and I've decided I can't worry about them. But sometimes I do worry, anyway. (iS-III-11)

We sense Serena's struggle with time. On one hand she feels a helpless frustration at the limits of time and at not being able to attend to many of the things to which she would like to attend. On the other, we hear a determined effort to take a more active and realistic control of time, consciously foregoing things that aren't as important to her in order to make more time for those things that are a priority. But we heard in her story about Laura how much she yearns for the chance to do more thinking and research. We see here, however, how her deep commitment to "my students" dictates the "have to's" she consciously chooses, preventing her from making an equally deep commitment to "my personal agenda". Is time the limiting culprit here? Or is it on an externalized time that we project our struggle with the question of how we ought to live our lives? As we have already seen, the ethos of service can be very strong, impelling some of us to forego actions that are "smart" in terms of career advancement or self-fulfillment in order to do what is "smart" in terms of service to students. We can imagine, for example, that Serena's decision to answer students' questions rather than attend a faculty council will not earn her many career Brownie points. Through how we live

time, we can see once more the potential for conflict between our commitment as teacher educators and our commitment as university professors.

As we saw in Rachel's story and in a discussion of Kotre's work on generativity, there are also times when it is difficult to maintain a balance between commitment to our students and commitment to our search for deeper understanding. The way we live time reflects our struggle with the shifting tensions and meaning within our pedagogical mission. If we are to ever possess our time, living in it and flowing with it instead of swimming against it, each of us must consciously reflect on how we live time, and in so doing, meaningfully renew or change the choices we make in a way that takes what time really can be into account.

D. Controlling Time: The Institutional versus the Personal

Throughout the interviews I heard many complaints about "the system", about the technocratic and bureaucratic demands of the university on our time. An occasional sadness or hopelessness permeated some of the interviews. For the most part, however, despite the obstacles of institutional life, the participants seemed hopeful of somehow finding at least a little time for "my work"; for the

work they personally feel is the most meaningful and important to them. There were also occasional flashes of determined defiance. As soon as we turned our conversation away from university demands and scarcity of time to talk instead of our intentions, experiences, and dreams, we came alive and hope surged. It was almost as if the participants felt that despite all the hindrances that are perceived as needlessly attached to the role of professor, the university remains the best place to be a teacher educator. Perhaps we think that if we ignore the mindless and sometimes undermining routines and demands, they will eventually disappear. Perhaps in part to avoid the pain of confrontation, we adopt, as it were, a strategy of silence that permits us to remain a part of the university community. Perhaps we look beyond the everyday aspects of university life to the promise and the possibility of what a university can be. As long as we are at the university, we can keep our dreams; there is always the promise of tomorrow. To leave the university might mean to give up our dreams altogether.

The picture I have just painted of grudging but nonetheless acquiescent compliance, even complicity, is of course not the whole story. It is rather how the participants sometimes live their lives. At other times, a strong determination to find a way around "the system" dominates.

Sometimes, there was even talk of changing "the system", of speaking out and being heard, of coming up with alternative ways of viewing and ordering lived time as professors. Ilana, for example, said that she was going to start refusing requests to sit on committees or to fill out questionnaires, or to be secretary at meetings, and that she was going to stay at home one day a week to write no matter what any one said. A former colleague of mine at another university keeps pushing for a different and more flexible way of giving students credit, and for a more qualitative way of evaluating student teaching. Still another professor I know keeps voicing his objections to promotion practices that undervalue those times he feels should be most valued. But publicly speaking our defiance and frustration is one thing, acting further on it is another.

E. Time as Enemy and Tyrant : The Personal and Social Structuring of Time

During our fourth interview, Josee gave me her stream of consciousness impressions of lived time during some typically hectic days:

> Josee: [during class today], I did have to give those papers back. I did have to give out papers for the new theme. I had to tell them where to go in the schools, and I had to talk about assignments. Those four things. And I felt as if I couldn't start [the new topic] of the adolescent, but I didn't dare not start it. (iJ-IV-1)

Josee is pointing to the tyranny of the institutional clock that seems to bring our classes prematurely to an end, evoking for me the image of Charlie Chaplin trying to hang on to the hands of the clock in "Modern Times". Events so rarely unfold exactly as we plan them, but we sometimes have difficulty accepting that our imaginations are not up to the task of foreseeing almost all. Perhaps like many of us, Josee doesn't "dare" disobey her plan. She won't give in to the clock that contradicts her, although in another sense, that is precisely what she is doing.

Josee's comments evoke the self-imposed tyranny

of the syllabus we ourselves construct that seems to demand we set out in a race to cover the material in the time allotted for our course. The "have to's" of an internalized sense of duty or responsibility once again are loudly heard, urging us to "fit" into one hour that which we fear simply cannot fit. It is almost as if in planning our time, we forget or ignore the realities of time. In writing a syllabus, it is sometimes as if we set out to include all our ideals, all that we feel is meaningful and important, intending in one or two courses to somehow fulfill all our pedagogical dreams, giving our students everything we have to give. But no sooner is it written, than the idealistic statement that a syllabus usually is becomes presented to both ourselves, our administrators, and our students not only as probable, but as a minimum expectation. In the ensuing rush, we might "cover" our material rather than "discover" it in the meaningful way we may have originally envisioned. Our syllabus can become a commodity that we parcel out in strict measures of limited time. When this occurs, no thought can be given to the students' time. In a race to beat the bell that signals our time is up, we might rapidly talk our way through the syllabus, conscientiously orchestrating thirty second interchanges to involve our students, but secretly panic-stricken as we realize we might lose the race. And yet, next time around, we may once again try to fool ourselves, saying, "Maybe this time, I can do this and this

and this and this all in one course".

Thus, we often seem to live the present anxiously trying to control the future. In assuming that all educational activities must be thoroughly planned, we "ignore the fullness of the eternal present for the sterility of the known future" (Huebner:1975,p.220). We forget or choose not to see the lessons of our present, (which as soon as we reflect on it becomes our present past), and of our past (which speaks to us in the present). Rather than being a comfortable space in which to live because it is a very part of us, time becomes an external, objectified enemy to be defeated. But making an enemy of time is in a sense, making an enemy of ourselves:

> Time is not a dimension in which we live....The very notion of time arises out of [human] existence, which is emergent....Human life is not futural; nor is it past, but, rather, a present made up of a past and future brought into the moment....The point is that [the human being] is temporal; or if you wish, historical.... human life is never fixed but is always emergent as the past and future become horizons of a present. (Heubner: 1975,p.244)

F. Time as Isolating, as Not Ours

The participants commented on how much they enjoyed talking to me about their work, telling me that the hectic pace of their daily lives did not usually afford many such opportunities. Although we do interact within the formalized structure of departmental and committee meetings,

this interaction is usually of a different kind. Instead of fully exchanging ideas, instead of sharing our lived experience, questions, and doubts, we often remain isolated from our colleagues as we rush about doing what we "have to" do. Serena, for example, said that most of her interaction is with the one or two colleagues with whom she works closely; she has "no time" for collaborating or exchanging ideas with her many other colleagues, although she wistfully imagines that it would be very stimulating and useful to do so. The isolation of teachers in schools is a well documented phenomenon (Lortie: 1975; Copeland & Jamgochian: 1985); this phenomenon seems at times to extend to faculties of education as well. What Lortie (1975) calls the "closed door" mentality of the schools can pervade many university departments as well.

The structural time constraints of our institutional lives seem to work against regular and rewarding collegial interaction. There seems to be little opportunity for common "free time". Time may be experienced almost as a prison, and in our isolation we may feel powerless to affect the structures we find so constraining. Perhaps we ourselves sometimes encourage and maintain our isolation by keeping collegial interaction low on the crowded list of priorities that claim our time. In this way we participate unwittingly in the maintenance of the very

aspects of our lives that we too silently wish we could change. Once again we project on an exteriorized time our struggle in deciding how we ought to live our lives. Determined at least to appear in control of time (to show that our time is planned and accounted for) we voluntarily give in without question to the institutional ordering of our lives. But in so doing we perhaps confirm that despite superficial appearances, our time, indeed, is <u>not</u> ours. We sacrifice ownership for the appearance of control.

> Owned (authentic) temporality is a temporality of openness and resoluteness whereas disowned (inauthentic) time passively passes as if the human subject were not in a time of his own making. (Troutner: 1974, p.169, after Heidegger:1962 and Alderman: 1971)

Troutner (1974) suggests that the prevalent inauthentic mode of living time leads to the fragmentation of self, the fragmentation that our little agenda books so perfectly illustrate. Could our determination to plan all our time instead of more freely exploring and experiencing it really be a way of avoiding finding out who we are?

G. <u>Lived Time</u>

Josee: I thought I was going to go crazy. I had people making demands left and right. I had one student who had problems with her practice teaching last Friday... She had cried and cried and so I had tried to help her. Monday I saw her in the hallway with three of her colleagues and although I had my son with me and two teachers from a school, I went up to her and asked "How

> did it go?" And she said it went really well....And this was at five o'clock and my son was crying because his teacher had given him a bad time and I had to show the two teachers the stage area for the play I was helping them put on. Finally I got the stage stuff settled and then my son went and sulked somewhere in a corner and then he finally came back and we sat down and I talked with him. And then one of the other students...popped her head in and here I was in the middle of a very important conversation with my son and by then I knew I was late to pick up my little girl and I had an important meeting with colleagues at 7 o'clock. I had to hurry home and make supper and them come back, but this student wanted to talk. Finally I was able to rush home and get back. I finally finished at 10 o'clock and was up this morning at six and my little girl had a stomach ache and cried and I feel half dead....I sometimes feel very bewildered and pressed for time. Today I've got to be in the school in ten minutes and then I've got to rush back because I've got a pile of work on my desk up to here and then from 2:30 until 5:30 I've got a rehearsal and so on.

Later that day I saw Josee sitting on a stair in a stairwell, her body slumped and her gaze hazy, focussing on some distant point. She looked so very tired but also natural and settled; she seemed to "fit" there, almost as if she was a part of the stairway. When I greeted her, she visibly awoke to the present with a slow smile and told me she was waiting for a group of high school students to arrive for a project in which she had gotten her students involved. She had been thinking, she said, of some exciting ideas. (How often I hear myself and others yearn for time to think). Having blown off some steam to me about the tyranny of time that morning, she was now almost happily subjecting herself to its rule, relishing the time of waiting as an unexpected gift, an opportunity for reflection. It is so often the

unplanned time, the given time, the unexpected opportunity to live more fully in the present that enriches our lives. Recall, for example, Rachel's delightful and unplanned meeting with Tara, or Serena's experiences with Laura or with the teachers. To the extent that we feel we have to do all the things that we and others expect of ourselves, "no matter what", we find ourselves planning and structuring our lived time in a way that permits few such occasions. Rather than face time honestly and accept with grace and pleasure the challenge of its various possibilities and limitations, rather than embrace not only the future, but also the past and the present, we too often view time from a producer-consumer perspective as a limited commodity outside of ourselves. We use time up and find there is not enough. In so doing, we are reflecting an attitude toward time that Meyerhoff (1960) suggests is prevalent in our society:

> This concept of time as a commodity has prevailed in the modern world. In contrast to the ancient and Medieval outlook, time in the modern world has become more and more an instrument serving no other function than to produce goods for consumption and profit -- hence the changed conception of ransoming time through ceaseless activity, production and profit, in contrast to the Greek idea of ransoming time through contemplation of eternal verities and values, or the Medieval conception of ransoming time through membership in the City of God and attainment of eternal salvation. (p.107)

Feeling obliged to control time, we end up becoming its prisoners, prisoners of a planning that does not

take the nature of time into account. Yet, as Kummel (1966) so insightfully points out, we are not merely chained to time. We can, as Heidegger (1962) shows, authentically choose how to live time by questioning time as being. Kummel, influenced by Heidegger, views freedom as essentially the freedom to dispose of time by accepting the challenge of the future as both unformed and unbounded possibility and at the same time as that which gives us the sharpest sense of our own limitations, of our finiteness, and of who we have been. Through an awareness of the nature of time, of time as part of our being, we can sense both our power and our impotence and accept the shifting tension between them as a challenge that guides our living.

H. Time as Trancendent

Let us consider one final aspect of lived time. During one particular interview, Ted, like Josee, illustrated how pedagogical concerns permeate our lives outside of the artificial boundaries delimited by "work time" or by the time when we are acting or are seen as acting as professors of education:

> Ted: I do try to get away from it [teacher education] sometimes, for example, on vacations I would like to leave it all behind, as it were, to clear up my head. But I

> suspect that even then it encroaches upon things a lot more that I think.... Whether you're on vacation or whether you're reading a book, I think that often you see things around you or you perceive things in some way as being potentially useful to you as an educator. To illustrate with an example from another profession... when I was in college I worked in a shipyard and I worked as a carpenter's mate and I spent a lot of time looking for tools that I had dropped the night before. I seemed able to divorce my work from other things,... but then I wasn't interested in spending the rest of my life as a carpenter's mate, it was just something I did. But I'm sure that if I were a carpenter I would have acted differently. When I'd walk through doors I'd look for the fit, or I'd notice joints in furniture. I'm sure that the way true carpenters look at the world is controlled by their job, just like a teacher educator looks at the world in a certain way too.
>
> Even now I find that if I'm waiting for a member of my family in a shopping center, for example, I tend to watch the children who are around more that I watch other things. I might find myself studying the relationships between kids, or between kids and parents or adults, or what kinds of books the kids are looking at, or what kinds of things they like to do, or what they talk about. So in a way I think it's [being a teacher educator] an orientation. It's kind of hard to escape from that. (reconstructed from iT-I-34,35)

Just as we saw how Josee balances and blends her dual role as parent and as teacher educator, we see in this excerpt from Ted's interview how our professional attending does not respect the narrowly delimited time and space of our socially defined jobs. Being a teacher educator is viewing the world in all times and places in a certain way. The time for being a teacher educator transcends the time allotted to it. For most of us, teacher education is a way of being, not just something we do to bring home a paycheque. It can break through the official boundaries of

time and place that we and others try to impose, permeating our other ways of being in the world, and shaping in a very powerful way who we are.

CHAPTER SEVEN COMPLETING THE CIRCLE

The participants and I have sustained a lengthy dialogue. We have explored and described significant aspects of our lives as teacher educators, raising new questions about our lives along the way. Through asking questions as we answered others, we have come almost full circle. To complete that circle, I must now return to the original questions that guided this research.

I. Images

What images of teacher education emerge from the lifeworld of teacher educators?

Teacher education as poetry:

Ilana's story revealed the power of poetry to breathe life into our theorizing, to uncover meaning, and to illuminate our lives. We sense something simple, yet profound and beautiful about her poem. Can we not say the same thing about the participants' stories and indeed about the nature of teacher education? Like a good poem, perhaps teacher education should lift a veil from our eyes, permitting our students and us to see pedagogy in new and meaningful ways. Perhaps, like Ilana's poem, teacher education could point to a way of fulfilling our pedagogical

dreams.

Teacher education as sharing a special and meaningful book:

Rachel's first story offers us the image of the beautiful big book that Tara made. That book reflected deep pedagogical concern and hope in its conception, in its making, and in the way it was offered and used. The book was a wonderful, enchanting invitation to participate meaningfully in pedagogical life through authentic sharing. Could this not also be an inspiring image for teacher education? What if teacher education more often extended such an invitation? What if we more often attended to our students with the same concern and hope and presence as Tara did? Perhaps we could view teacher education as colourful, beautiful, engaging, meaningful, and like Tara's book, as revealing a myriad of possibilities for growth and learning for both teacher and student.

Teacher education as floundering in wallpaper paste:

From Rachel's second story, we can borrow the wonderfully original metaphor of teacher education as a plunge into wallpaper paste. It so plainly and humorously evokes the cloying blandness we sometimes find in teacher education (in ourselves and our students, in government

regulations, in our programs and institutions) and the fogginess we can encounter in our attempts to communicate. A plunge into wallpaper paste serves as an image of how easily we can become bogged down in sticky bureaucratic or technical detail or in our own obscure theorizing. We can become numbed by and accustomed to uniform blandness, no longer noticing when we grow awkward in our movements, no longer aware that the uniformly opaque layers through which we view the world are keeping us from seeing as clearly as we might. Immersed in stickiness, we may not notice the paste that coats us as we thrash about, making us appear quite comical and different from how we imagine ourselves to look. Perhaps our students, too, experience teacher education as wallpaper paste. Rachel's metaphor is perhaps an important warning to be aware of the taken for granted, invisible aspects of teacher education that lull us into complacency.

Teacher education as a shining jewel or creation:

In talking about her play, Josee offers us a vision of pedagogical practice as "a small shining jewel, so perfect, so full of hope and life and potential". She worked so hard, putting her beliefs and knowledge and faith and talent into helping a group of children. Later, in watching them perform on their own, she views what they created together as a shining jewel. Even though the play ends, it

leaves a permanent trace in the lives of those who created it. Jewels are rare and valued and enduring. They are things of beauty that spark our imagination and our appreciation, making possible a deeply aesthetic experience. Perhaps they symbolize the sort of thing we strive for in teacher education.

Teacher education as a dream that turns to ashes:

Filled with wonderful dreams of what education can be, Josee sees her dreams turn to ashes when she is confronted by students who express their opposing views and who do not respond to her call to dialogue. Here is a fitting metaphor for the way we sometimes feel when we are denied confirmation, especially, for example, when our theories seem suddenly irrelevant in the harsh light of practice, or when our strongest beliefs are challenged by others, or when our most cherished ideas are shown to be inadequate. The metaphor points to a danger: in order to avoid the pain of disillusionment and confrontation, we and our partners in teacher education may be tempted either to stop dreaming and theorizing or to stop testing our dreams and theories. But not all dreams turn to ashes, and from those that do, perhaps truer dreams can emerge phoenix-like from the ashes.

Teacher education as collecting milk money:

Too often, Serena feels, professors and teachers find themselves spending whole days "collecting milk money" instead of fulfilling the potential and the dreams for which their long years of education prepared them. The metaphor points to our occasional boredom with the numerous mundane and routine aspects of everyday professional life. It offers us yet another image for our frequent disillusionment with the bureaucratic and technocratic dimensions of our lived reality. The metaphor implies that collecting milk money is not of great pedagogical value, and that although it might be a necessary task, someone else should be doing it. It evokes a yearning for more meaningful pedagogical action, for a doing that leads to growth and to professional confirmation. Perhaps our students too sometimes experience teacher education as collecting milk money.

Teacher education as pushing back the boundaries:

In describing her experience with a graduate student, Serena spoke of how hard they both worked "to push back the boundaries", offering us another apt metaphor for teaching and learning. Her metaphor provides a vision of teacher

education as a cooperative search for understanding that expands the landscapes of our world, revealing new meaning and new possibilities for our lives as pedagogues. The word "push" also evokes the resistance or struggle we can encounter in this active search: resistance, for example, in our own pre-conceptions or in those of others. The metaphor also conjures up an image of the pioneer or explorer, of teacher education as the charting of new territory. Is this not an appropriate description of part of our mission in teacher education?

Teacher education as breaking down walls:

During our interviews, Ted spoke often of "breaking down walls". Rachel, too, spoke of being dissatisfied with only "chipping away little chinks". They were referring, among other things, to breaking down the walls of isolation with which teachers surround themselves, and to overcoming the barriers to communication we so often encounter in teacher education. Ted and Rachel were also referring to their hope for dissolving some of the rather arbitrary boundaries that we have created between different academic disciplines. A call to break down walls is a call for action and for radical change. It can mean at least partially overcoming or setting aside what "is" in order to create what "ought" to be. It is perhaps a call to some sort of

pedagogical revolution. Ultimately, the metaphor might evoke a powerful image of teacher education as emancipation. Inspired by a song by the rock group, Pink Floyd, Ted suggests that if we cannot break down the wall, we should at the very least avoid becoming another brick in the wall ourselves. That is also the hope we have for our students.

II. What is it to be a Teacher Educator?

For most of us, being a teacher educator is a professional calling, a natural extension of our lives as teachers of children or as pedagogical inquirers:

> Each of us has need of the personal confirmation that can come only when we know our "calling - our existence in the fullest sense of the term - as an answer to a call....We need to feel that our work is "true" - both as a genuine expression of the reality that we encounter in our lives and as a genuine response to some situation or need that calls us. (Friedman: 1983, p.55)

A call may in itself be viewed as a response to a perhaps as yet unrecognized call from within us; for a call that does not beckon something already there within us is a call that we can not even hear. The call to be a teacher educator emanates from our lived experience with teachers and children. It awakens the hope that we can become more than (or as much as) we ever thought we could be, that we can do what we have not yet been able to do. It is, as so many of

the participants put it, "a challenge", a challenge we issue ourselves to rise to the opportunity, to test our ability, to participate meaningfully in the world, to consciously shape our future, and to find out more about who we are. For many of us, the call is difficult to ignore; to do so would leave one with a lifetime of "I could have been; I could have done".

As the participants make clear, being a teacher educator is a form of pedagogy. Throughout this study, teaching and learning (in the broadest sense of those words) have emerged as central to our lives as teacher educators. Pedagogy is part of our personal response to the call of the world, part of our search for what it means to be human. In becoming pedagogues, we are called to commit ourselves to the world through teaching and learning, to see these modes of being as vital to the continuity and the quality of human existence. Through the lived experience of our personal pedagogical history, many of us come to find meaning and hope for the world in the power and the beauty of teaching and learning. We glimpse in teaching and learning the possibility, even the promise, of emancipation. We thus find great joy both in our own learning and teaching and in the learning and teaching of others. Our joy confirms and renews our belief in the power of learning to raise us above the

mundane condition of our daily existence and to illuminate our lives. The joy of our learning gives momentum to our teaching, and through our teaching we reach yet deeper understanding of that which we teach. A dialogical relationship thus emerges between teaching and learning, each one confirming and transforming the other. Teaching and learning become for us inextricably entwined, overlapping aspects of the same whole, pedagogy. They represent our dual commitment: our commitment to our students and our commitment to deepen our own understanding. This commitment is sustained by and rests in our hope for the future of children, which is also our hope for the world.

Being a teacher educator can be seen as an expression of our generative striving (Kotre: 1984) to fulfill our pedagogical dreams for the future of children, a generative striving to make the potential some day possible. Sustained by our belief in the promise and power of teaching and learning, our commitment to teacher education rests in the hope that through our actions as teacher educators, we can indirectly touch the lives of children by touching the lives of our student-teachers, thereby making the world (and in particular, the schools) a better place to be. Through being with children, through our efforts to know who they are and who they can become, we come to see promising possibilities

of a pedagogical relationship with children that inspire us, inviting or reconfirming our personal commitment as teacher educators and shaping our theorizing and our actions. We come to see teacher education as a way of fulfilling these possibilities, as a way of making the imagined real. We find we have something to share, a legacy to pass on, a culture to renew. We are committed, however, not to rigid duplication of our favorite teaching methods, but to making pedagogical life "better". There will always be promising possibilities that we have not yet imagined. Our hope is that through our teaching, our students will be able to recognize the potential we ourselves may not see -- and may not live to see. While we wish to preserve and pass on our dreams, we also wish to encourage action that, while true to these dreams, may expand or change them.

Part of our pedagogical task as teacher educators thus becomes to learn how to call each of our students to become the best possible teacher he or she can become. Our mission, as Josee says, is to wake them up to pedagogy by waking them up to themselves and to the world. But we have seen in the stories that being able to call means being able also to respond, being able to make both our students and ourselves authentically "present". The pedagogy in which the teacher educator participates can be seen as dialogical

encounter that confirms all participants in the dialogue and that leads to action. Through pedagogical encounter, we hope to light a spark that will inspire and guide the teachers of the future. By offering our students an authentic vision that takes into account who they really are and who they might really become, we hope to help them uncover promising pedagogical possibilities that they might otherwise have missed, enabling them in turn to do the same for us and for the children they teach. These hopes reflect our specific desires to contribute to life, to leave something of ourselves behind, however slight, that will confirm our existence as meaningful and of value.

It is not always easy to be a teacher educator. Constrained and influenced by the institutionalization and politicization of our work, and confronted with our human limitations as well as those of our students and colleagues, we may find, as the participants sometimes did, that our actions can betray our pedagogical intentions, that we are often teacher educators in name but not in being. As we saw in the stories, however, those times when we fall away from pedagogy challenge us to face ourselves as teacher educators and to reflect on our actions. To the extent that we truly meet the challenge through authentic encounter with ourselves (reflection) and with others, we become more wide awake to

the possibilities of existence for us as teacher educators. In frequently confronting what is, we glimpse anew what ought to be and we renew our hope, our dreams, and our capacity to be teachers of teachers. Through action, we confront, modify, and confirm our dreams and theories, leading to further action and further evaluation. In living our professional lives, we are called again and again to question our pedagogical way of being and to respond to the challenges and calls of that life. In so doing, we can rediscover and reaffirm the meaning of being a teacher educator. As Ted suggests, being a teacher educator is a way of viewing the world and a mode of being that must be continually questioned and rediscovered. Like all callings, being a teacher educator is both the manifestation and the mode of our personal search for confirmation, generativity, and meaning. It is one of the ways in which we struggle continually with the questions of who we are and how we ought to live our lives. It is a way of participating meaningfully in life and of transforming the world.

III. Back to the Beginning : Some Personal Reflections

This dissertation began with a profusion of personal questions arising from my own life as a teacher educator. Have I found answers to any of those questions? How does this study speak to my own experience?

Doing this research has been for me a critical awakening to new awareness and to new possibilities as a teacher educator. The images and stories that have emerged have already served to guide and inspire, and also to caution my own practice. I find myself, for example, more often aware of those moments when I am not attending to my students. I search for better ways to call and to respond to my students, and I feel a little better prepared to meet the Amys and the Taras and the Lauras in my life.

The opening questions in chapter one reflect my personal struggle with what it means to be a teacher educator. In discovering how the participants were called to struggle in a similar fashion, I have come to view this search for meaning as an essential part of being a teacher educator and as a reflection of our commitments--to inquiry and learning, to calling into question, and to seeing the

ever present possibility of deeper understanding.

In re-examining my first questions, I notice that I was perplexed by my students' constant questions of a technical "how". I was disappointed that they did not seem very interested in the "what" and the "why" of teaching. But I see now that my questions, too, were preoccupied, at least on the surface, with the "how" of teacher education. The "how's" --the actions-- of our lives do seem important, but the findings of this study have challenged me to consider that perhaps the "how's" are meaningful only as they relate to the "what" and the "why", that is, as they relate to our dreams, our theories, our purpose, and our being. Because of this research, I have come to think, like Josee, that we must each learn how we can best call our students. Perhaps we should also give some thought to what and for what we are calling them. We need some deep sense of what it means to call someone. As this study suggests, calling someone means being able at the same time to respond to their call. Perhaps our questions of "how" need to be reformulated, becoming not so much an inquiry into form and technique as an inquiry into essence and being. Such reformulations might reveal that such things as authenticity of presence and quality of being in the way we live our technical "how's" contribute to our ability to call and respond to our

students.

The opening questions of chapter one also spoke of a malaise that sometimes penetrates my life as teacher educator, but I was not initially very successful in pinning it down. As this study progressed, I have come much closer to understanding this malaise. Part of it was my lack of awareness of the dual nature of the teacher educator's commitment. Like the other participants, I am deeply commited both to helping each education student as much as possible and to fulfilling my own pedagogical dreams by testing and furthering my theories and knowledge. In many ways, fulfilling one commitment enables me to fulfill the other, but sometimes they are inevitably in conflict and this can lead me away from some of my students or away from some administrative or research endeavours. Sometimes the institutional, technical, and political aspects of being a "professor" seem to undermine or interfere with the being of a "teacher educator", making it difficult, for example, to implement certain pedagogical practices. Sometimes my strong commitment to my students as "teacher educator" seems to limit my action as "professor", on occasion making me feel somewhat like a stranger in the university community. My response to this occasional role conflict can only be one of critical reflection and action. I need to examine my own

lived time, my actions, and my priorities. Having deepened my understanding of what it is to be a teacher educator, I must now examine my life and ask, "Am I truly a teacher educator?" Through dialogue, I could perhaps also engage other members of the university community in the continued search for what it means to be a professor and a teacher educator. In exploring the "is", we glimpse the "ought" that strengthens or renews our personal sense of purpose. This study suggests that being a teacher educator means accepting the duality of our pedagogical being and learning to live within the shifting meanings and tensions of our dual commitment. In a sense, being a teacher educator seems to mean making one's personal peace with life within the hermeneutic circle.

But being a teacher educator is even more than that. In exploring our professional lives as teacher educators, we end up questioning the whole of our lives. My reflections on lived time as professor, for example, inevitably lead me to look anew at how I live time all the time. Cultural generativity, as another example, is not limited to my actions and thoughts concerning pedagogy. In attempting to understand my life as teacher educator, I end up confronting all the selves of myself-in-the world. Understanding the "deep structures" (van Manen: 1978) of being a teacher

educator of necessity implies a deeper understanding of what it is to be human.

IV. Implications and Further Questions

This study could have many implications and questions for teacher education and for further research. The following examples illustrate the sort of recommendations that could follow from considering the central issues that have been raised.

1. Perhaps more than anything else, this study illustrates the depth of involvement of teacher educators in their work, showing just how central it seems to be to their personal lives. It thus seems that any thorough consideration of teacher education should take into account its personal significance for teacher educators and the teacher educator's active and individual involvement. Although this implication seems basic and self-evident, the research literature is remarkably silent on the whole topic of teacher educators.

2. This study suggests that teacher educators rely more on their own personal experience, theorizing, and knowledge than on those formal models or research findings which are not a meaningful part of their lives. Their actions as professors

seem often to be a part of their generative striving. If this is indeed the case, any theory or research concerning the implementation of models of change in teacher education must take into account the professor's personal interpretation of those models and the profesor's generative needs and strivings. In other words, teacher educators are likely to teach what they personally believe is meaningful and significant for their students and for the future of education, despite any imposed organizational changes or changes in professional terminology. The questions thus arise of what is meaningful and of how can we make our theorizing more meaningful to colleagues and thus more likely to be applied?

3. Just what our professional language means may vary widely among individuals. This study has highlighted the usefulness of more concrete, evocative, or meaningful illustrations in our professional communication. Perhaps storytelling and anecdotes need to be given a more prominent and prestigious place in our formal literature, providing a way to make our theorizing and research findings more truly meaningful to the lives of educators.

4. The lived experience of teacher educators is not only individual and personal. Chapter six, for example,

illustrates some of the difficulties that teacher educators experience collectively and personally in lived time. There was some indication that their professional life is fragmented, harried, and often lived in a sort of isolation or lack of collegiality. There was evidence of difficulty in establishing and in living priorities, a difficulty that seems to rest in deeper issues of conflict of commitment and perhaps also in the nature of institutional life. Perhaps university communities need to examine institutional qualities that work against collegiality or that do not permit individual priorities to be expressed. Freilich's (1977) distinction between the "smart" and the "proper" might be helpful in discovering the differences between what people (administrators included) say they do and want to do and what they really do and want to do.

5. The duality of the teacher educator's commitment was one of the most significant findings of this study. Related questions arise for further research concerning the role of university professors of education and the nature of university teaching. Do we all have to have the same priorities? Can similar commitments be expressed differently? Perhaps we could further explore the different ways we live the dual commitment to teaching and to advancing our own understanding (Kotre's concept of professional

culture)? What institutional qualities could be helpful or empowering, enabling us to maintain and enhance this dual commitment? Could the concept of cultural generativity be useful in re-examining university life?

6. The participants illustrated how the joy of our own learning can give momentum to our teaching, giving us the desire to share what we have learned. How or why is this so? What is this joy? Why does it call to us to share? How can we share our learning in a way that is helpful to others? Does the question of how to call one's students provide a useful and practical starting point for inquiry into teaching? This study suggests that being present in an authentic dialogue that truly takes the other into account seems to be part of the answer. But what does this mean? This study has provided a few specific illustrations, but perhaps more are needed. Perhaps we each also need to look to our own lived experience for further understanding. In addition, perhaps our institutions could be bold enough to make the joy of learning and teaching a more important part of their purpose and a focus of their self-examination.

7. This study could be used to shed a critical light on the continued popularity of quantitative management and behavioural models in educational theory and practice.

Perhaps we should give more attention to theories and practices that recognize and address such phenomena as the need for confirmation, the nature of dual commitments, the interrelatedness of teaching and learning, the search for personal meaning in one's life, and the nature of generative striving.

BLANK PAGE INSERTED

REFERENCES

Aoki, Ted (1979) "Toward Curriculum Inquiry in a New Key." Occasional paper no. 2. Department of Secondary Education, Faculty of Education, University of Alberta.

Apple, Michael (1979) Ideology and Curriculum. Boston: Routlegde and Kegan-Paul.

Arnstine, Donald (1977) "Who's Got the Quality? Individuals and the Profession." California Journal of Teacher Education. 4(3), 12-16.

Bannister, David (1968) "Psychology as an Exercise in Paradox." In D. Schultz, The Science of Psychology: Critical Reflections. New York: Schocken Books, 86-87.

Barritt, Loren (1985) "Research as a Rhetorical Process." Paper presented at the Fourth International Human Science Research Conference. Edmonton.

Barritt, Loren; Beekman, Ton; Bleeker, Hans; & Mulderij, Karel (1983) A Handbook for Phenomenological Research in Education. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

_____ (1984) "Analyzing Phenomenological Descriptions." Phenomenology and Pedagogy . 2(1), 1-17.

Bartholomew, J. (1976) "Schooling Teachers: The Myth of the Liberal College." In G. Whitty & M. Young (eds.), Explorations in the Politics of School Knowledge. Nafferton, England: Nafferton Books.

Benjamin, Walter (1969) Illuminations. New York: Schocken Books.

Benne, K. (1970) "Authority in Education." Harvard Educational Review. 40(3), 385-410.

Berne, Eric (1964) Games People Play. New York: Grove Press.

Bohannan, Laura (1966) "Shakespeare in the Bush." Natural History Magazine. August/September, 22-38.

Borshay Lee, Richard (1969) "A Naturalist at Large: Eating Christmas in the Kalahari." Natural History Magazine. 44-57.

Bourdieu, P. & Passeron, J.C. (1977) Production in Education, Society and Culture. Beverly Hills, California: Sage.

Bossart, W. H. (1969) "Three Directions of Phenomenology." In Grene (ed.), The Anatomy of Knowledge. Amherst: University of Massachussetts Press.

Breed, Charles. (1983) "Folk, Wisdom, and Hindsight." The Human Science Newsletter. Phenomenology Seminar, School of Education, University of Michigan, Fall, 3-4.

Brimfield, Renee; Roderick, Jessie; & Yamamoto, Kaoru (1983) "Persons as Researchers: Observations of the Participants." Curriculum Inquiry. 13(1).

Buber, Martin (1965) Between Man and Man . Ronald G. Smith (trans.), New York: Macmillan.

_____ (1966) The Knowledge of Man: A Philosophy of the Interhuman. Maurice Friedman (ed.), New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1966.

Carr, Alden J. (1962) "Classroom Paradox." Journal of Teacher Education. 13(2), 165-168.

Carr, David & Casey, Edward S. (1973) Explorations in Phenomenology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Cohen, Louis & Manion, Lawrence (1980) Research Methods in Education. London: Croom Helm Ltd.

Cooper, J.C. (1981) "Why Man Is Prior to Science in any Science of Man: The Epistemological Order of Value and Fact." In J. Royce and L. Mos (eds.), Humanistic Psychology: Concepts and Criticisms. New York: Plenum Press.

Craig, Peter Erik (1977) The Heart of the Teacher: An Inquiry into the Inner World of Teaching. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Faculty of Education, University of Boston.

Denton, David (1974) "Concepts and Strategies of Phenomenological Research." Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association. San Francisco.

_____ (1979) "That Mode of Being Called Teaching." In D. Denton (ed.), Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 99-115.

Dilthey, Wilhelm (1976) "The Rise of the Hermeneutic Tradition." In Connerton (ed.), Critical Sociology. Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Dohrenwend, B.S. and Richardson, S. A. (1964) "A Use for Leading Questions in Research Interviewing". Human Organization. 23, 76-77.

Dumont, J.P. (1978) The Headman and I: Ambiguity and Ambivalence in the Fieldworking Experience. Austin: University of Texas Press.

Erikson, Frederick (1973) "Some Approaches to Inquiry in School-Community Ethnography." Anthropology and Education Quarterly. 4(2).

Erikson, Erik (1963) Childhood and Society. 2nd ed., New York: Norton.

_____ (1964) Insight and Responsibility. New York: Norton.

Everett Turner, Lorene (1984) Toward Understanding the Lived World of Three Beginning Teachers of Young Children. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta.

Festinger. L. (1975) Theory of Cognitive Dissonance. Evanston, Illinois: Row, Peterson.

Frankl, Victor E. (1963) Man's Search for Meaning. New York: Pocket Books.

Friedman, Maurice (1983) The Confirmation of Otherness in Family, Community, and Society. New York: Pilgrim Press.

Freilich, Morris (1970) Marginal Natives: Anthropologists at Work. New York: Harper and Row.

_____ (1977) Toward a Formalization of Fieldwork. New York: Harper and Row.

Gadamer, Hans-Georg (1975) Truth and Method. London: Sheed and Ward.

_____ (1976) Philosophical Hermeneutics. Berkely: University of California Press.

Geertz, Clifford (1973) The Interpretation of Cultures. New York: Basic Books.

George, Paul S. (1974) "Down from the Tower." Peabody Journal of Education. 51(3), 211-216.

Giorgi, Amadeo (1970) Psychology as a Human Science. New York: Harper and Row.

Giroux, H. (1981) "Teacher Education and the Ideology of Social Control." In Ideology, Culture, and the Process of Schooling. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Glaser, B, and Strauss, A. (1967) The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research. Chicago: Aldine.

Glazer, Myron. The Research Adventure: Promises and Problems of Fieldwork. New York: Random House.

Goetz, Judith, and Le Compte, Margaret (1980) "Ethnographic Research and the Problem of Data Reduction." Anthropology and Education Quarterly. XII(1), 51-69.

Goldhammer, Keith (1981) "Teacher Education: Reality, Hope, and Promise." Journal of Teacher Education. XXXII(5), 25-29.

Goodlad, John I. (1984) A Place Called School. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Harre, R. (1978) "Accounts, Actions, and Meanings." In M. Brenner and P. Marsh (eds.), The Social Context of Method. London: Croom Helm.

Heidegger, Martin (1967) Being and Time. Translated by Macquarrie and Robinson. Oxford: Blackwell.

_____ (1975) Poetry, Language, and Thought. Translated by A. Hofstadter. New York: Harper Colophon Books.

_____ (1977) Martin Heidegger: Basic Writings. David Krell (ed.), New York: Harper and Row.

Hersom, Naomi; Birch, Daniel; Gaskell, James; Horowitz, Myer;

& Plante, Jean (1981) "Teacher Education: Description and Definition of Research." In John Andrews and W. Todd Rogers (eds.), Canadian Research in Education: A State of the Art Review. Report prepared for the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. University of British Columbia.

Horowitz, Myer (1974) "Teacher Education: Souffle de Fromage or Cheese Omelet?" In Myers and Reid (eds.), Educating Teachers: Critiques and Proposals. Ontario: OISE.

Housego, Ian E. (1982) "The Professor as Teacher: An Ethical Analyis." The Canadian Administrator. 21(5).

Huebner, Dwayne (1975) "Curriculum as Concern for Man's Temporality." In W. Pinar, Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkeley: McCutchan Publishing.

Hultgren, Francine (1983) "Reflecting on the Meaning of Curriculum Through a Hermeneutic Interpretation of Student-teaching Experiences." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, Montreal.

Hunsberger, Margaret (1983) The Encounter Between Reader and Text. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Elementary Education, University of Alberta.

Hyman, Ronald T. (1968) Teaching: Vantage Points for Study. New York: J.B. Lippincott Company.

Jackson, P. (1968) Life in Classrooms. New York: Holt, Rinehardt, & Winston.

Johanninameier, Erwin V. & Merritt, James (1978) Science of Education and the Education Professoriate. Occasional Papers Series, No. 10, Northern Illinois University.

Joyce, Bruce & Clift, Renee (1984) "The Phoenix Agenda: Essential Reform in Teacher Education." Educational Researcher. April, 5-18.

Kaplan, Abraham (1964) The Conduct of Inquiry: Methodology for Behavioral Science. Scranton: Chandler Publishing.

Kotre, John (1984) Outliving the Self: Generativity and the Interpretation of Lives. Baltimore: John Hopkins University Press.

Kuhn, Thomas S. (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions. (2nd ed.), Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Kummel, F. (1966) "Time as Succession and the Problem of Duration." In J. T. Fraser, The Voice of Time: A Cooperative Study of Man's Views of Time as Expressed by the Sciences and by the Humanities. New York: Braziller.

Kurtz, C. & Kremer, L. (1982) "Personality Characteristics and Teaching Behavior." Education. 102 (4), 359-365.

Le Compte, Margaret, & Goetz, Judith (1982) "Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research." Review of Educational Research. 52(1), 31-60.

Leslie, L. (1970) "Faculty React to Student Participation." Journal of Teacher Education. 21(1).

Lortie, Dan C. (1975) Schoolteacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Luckmann, Thomas, ed. (1978) Phemomenology and Sociology: Selected Readings. New York: Penguin Books.

Lutz, F. (1978) "What Is the Role of Research in Policy Formation and Implementation: 'The R' of R & D." The Generation. 8.

Marcel, Gabriel (1965) Being and Having. Translated by K. Farrer. London: Collins.

_____ (1978) Homo Viator: Introduction to a Metaphysic of Hope. Peter Smith Publishing.

Marcus, George (1980) "Rhetoric and the Ethnographic Genre in Anthropological Research." Current Anthropology. 24(5), 507-510.

Meyerhoff, H. (1960) Time and Literature. Berkely: University of California Press.

McCutheon, G. (1978) "On the Interpretation of Classroom Observations." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting. Toronto.

McIntosh, R.G. (1977) "Lessons Taught by a Cuckoo, a Seagull, and a Fox." Challenge. 12 (1), 26-31.

Merleau-Ponty, Maurice (1962) Phenomenology of Perception. Colin Smith (trans.), London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Miles, Matthew & Huberman, A. Michael (1984) "Drawing Valid Meaning from Qualitative Data: Toward a Shared Craft." Educational Researcher. May, 20-29.

Misiak, H. & Sexton, V. S. (1975) Phenomenological, Existential, and Humanistic Psychologies: A Historical Survey. New York: Greene & Stratton.

Mooney, Ross (1975) "The Researcher Himself." In W. Pinar (ed.), Curriculum Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkely: McCuthan

Publishing Corporation.

Murphy, Robert F. (1979) An Overture to Social Anthropology. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Novak, Michael (1978) Ascent of the Mountain, Flight of the Dove: An Invitation to Religious Studies. (rev. ed.), San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Ogilvy, James (1977) Many Dimensional Man: Decentralizing Self, Society, and the Sacred. New York: Oxford University Press.

Palmer, Parker (1983) To Know as We Are Known: A Spirituality of Education. San Francisco: Harper & Row.

Palmer, Richard E. (1969) Hermeneutics. Evanston: Northwestern University Press.

Peck, R. & Turner, J. (1973) "Research on Teacher Education." In R. Travers (ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Peterson, P; Marx, C; & Clark, R. (1978) "Teacher Planning, Teacher Behaviour, and Student Achievement." American Educational Research Journal. 15(3).

Phenix, Philip H. (1964) "Teaching as Celebration." In Realms of Meaning. New York: McGraw-Hill.

_____ (1974) "Unamuno on Love and Pedagogy." In D. Denton (ed.), Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

_____ (1975) "Transcendence and the Curriculum." In W. Pinar (ed.), Curriculm Theorizing: The Reconceptualists. Berkely: McCutchan Publishing.

Pike, Kenneth L. (1966) Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior. The Hague: Mouton & Company.

Pike, Ruth (1979) "Student-teachers' View of Reality: Child." Paper presented at the American Educational Research Association annual meeting, San Francisco, April.

Polokow, Valerie (1985) "The Politics of Language." Paper presented at the Fourth International Human Science Research Conference. Edmonton.

Polanyi, Michael (1962) Personal Knowledge. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Polkinghorne, Donald (1983) Methodology for the Human Sciences: Systems of Inquiry. New York: State University of New York Press.

Polya, Gyorgy (1954) Mathematics and Plausible Reasoning: Induction and Analogy in Mathematics. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Popkewitz, Thomas, Tabachnick, Robert, & Zeichner, Kenneth (1979) "Dulling the Senses: Research in Teacher Education." Journal of Teacher Education. 30(5).

Popkewitz,Thomas & Tabachnick, Robert (1981) The Study of Schooling. New York: Praegar.

Postman, Neil (1979) Teaching as a Conserving Activity. New York: Dell Publishing.

Radnitzky, G. (1970) Contemporary Schools of Meta Science. Toteborg, Sweden: Scandinavian University Books.

Rabinow, Paul (1977) Reflections on Fieldwork in Morocco . Berkely: University of California Press.

Rabinow, Paul & Sullivan, William M. (1979) Interpretive Social Science: A Reader. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Richardson, Miles (1974) "Anthropologist -- the Myth Teller." American Ethnologist. 517-530.

Richmond, Ronald (1983) Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Elementary Education, University of Alberta.

Ricoeur, Paul (1973) "Human Sciences and Hermeneutical Method: Meaningful Action Considered as a Text." In D. Carr & E. Casey, Explorations in Phenomenology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 13-45.

_____ (1976) Interpretation Theory: Discourse and the Surplus of Meaning. Fort Worth, Texas: The Texas Christian University Press.

_____ (1978) C. Reagan & D. Stewart (eds.), The Philosophy of Paul Ricoeur: An Anthology of his Work. Boston: Beacon Press.

Rist, Ray (1983) "On the Means of Knowing: Qualitative Research in Education." New York Education Quarterly. February.

Roche, Maurice (1973) Phenomenology, Language, and Social Sciences. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Roderick, Jessie (1984) Perspectives on Self as Teacher: Cracks in the Technocratic. Occasional Paper no. 28, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Publication Services.

Rogers, Carl (1951) Client-centered Therapy. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Rosenshine, Barak (1976) "Recent Research on Teaching

Behaviors and Student Achievement." Journal of Teacher Education. 27(1).

Ross, Heidi (1980) "Understanding Pedagogy: the Witness, the Storyteller, and the Teacher." In V. Polokow-Suransky (ed.), The Friere Papers. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Ryan, K., ed. (1975) Teacher Education: The Seventy-fourth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, part II. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Sarason, J. B. (1971) The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Schalock, H. (1980) "Eating Humble Pie: Notes on Methodology in Teacher Education Research." In G. Hall, S. Hord, & G. Brown (eds.), Exploring the Issues in Teacher Education. Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Schutz, Alfred & Luckmann, Thomas (1973) The Structures of the Life-world. Translated by Richard Zaner & H. Tristram Engelhardt Jr., Evanston, Illinois: Nortwestern University Press.

Shulman, L. S., ed. (1978) Review of Research in Education. vol. 6. Itasca, Illinois: American Research Association.

Silverman, David (1975) Reading Castenada: A Prologue to the Social Sciences. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd.

Smith, David (1980) "Toward a Critical Hermeneutic of the Child for Curriculum." A dissertation proposal. Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta.

_____ (1983) The Meaning of Children in the Lives of Adults: A Hermeneutic Study. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Department of Secondary

Education, University of Alberta.

Smith, G. & Turner, D. (1979) Challenging Anthropology. Toronto: McGraw Hill Ryerson Ltd.

Spain, David, ed. (1978) The Human Experience: Readings in Sociocultural Anthropology. Homewood, Illinois: Dorsey Press.

Spiegelberg, Herbert (1975) Doing Phenomenology. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

Splaine, J. (1981) "Studying Teaching: A Critical Appraisal by a Participant-observer." Paper prepared for the annual meeting of the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education. Detroit.

Spradley, James (1979) The Ethnographic Interview. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Straus, Erwin W., ed. (1964) Phenomenology: Pure and Applied. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

Taylor, William (1978) Research and Reform in Teacher Education. Council of Europe Trend Reports on Educational Research: NFER Publishing.

Troutner, Leroy (1974) "Time and Education." In D. Denton, Existentialism and Phenomenology in Education. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Turner, Barry (1981) "Some Practical Aspects of Qualitative Data Analysis: One Way of Organising the Cognitive Processes Associated with the Generation of Grounded Theory." Quality and Quantity. 15, 225-247.

van den Berg, J. H. (1972) A Different Existence: Principles of Phenomenological Psychopathology.

Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press.

van Manen, Max (1977) "Linking Ways of Knowing with Ways of Being Practical." Curriculum Inquiry. 6(3).

_____ (1978) "An Experiment in Educational Theorizing: The Utrecht School." Interchange. 10(1).

_____ (1984) Doing Phenomenological Research and Writing: An Introduction. Monograph no. 7, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Publication Services.

Wax, Rosalie (1971) Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Weckowicz, Theodore (1981) "The Impact of Phenomenological and Existential Philosophies on Psychaitry and Psychotherapy." In J. Royce & L. Mos (eds.), Humanistic Psychology. New York: Plenum Press.

Werner, W. & Rothe, P. (1979) Doing School Ethnography. Monograph no. 2, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta, Publication Services.

Wild, John (1964) "Husserl's Life-world and the Lived Body." In E. Strauss (ed.), Phenomenology: Pure and Applied. Pittsburgh: Duquesne University Press, 10-42.

Wilson, Stephen (1977) "The Use of Ethnographic Techniques in Educational Research." Review of Educational Research. 47(1).

Willson, Victor L. & Horn, Jerry G. (1979) "Differences in Science Teaching Attitudes among Secondary Teachers, Principals, College Teacher Trainers, and Teacher Trainees." Journal of Research in Science Teaching. 16(5), 385-89.

Wolcott, Harry (1973) The Man in the Principal's Office.

New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.

Young, G. (1980) "The Attitudes of Teachers in Further Education." British Journal of Educational Psychology. June, 50(2).

Zeichner, Kenneth & Tabachnick, Robert (1981) "Are the Effects of University Teacher Education Washed Out by School Experience?" Journal of Teacher Education. 32(3).